The American Ecclesiastical Review

VOL. CXXVII, No. 1 JULY, 1952

CONTENTS

The School and the Community . . . *Bishop Edwin V. O'Hara* 1

Wanted: "Shoe Leather" Apostles . . . . . *John A. O'Brien* 10

The Study of History and Clerical Education, *Thomas T. McAvoy, C.S.C.* 19

The Purpose of the Missions: Comment on a Reply, *Patrick O'Connor* 25

Queen of Mercy. Part II . . . *Thomas Urban Mullaney, O.P.* 31

The Equipment of the Marriage Counselor, *John W. Stafford, C.S.V.* 36

A Quest of Thoughts. Part VII . . . . . *John K. Ryan* 48

Philosophical Implications of *Humani Generis*, Part II *Robert Paul Mohan, S.S.* 58

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Patronal Feast of Parish 67

Benediction Rubrics 67

Marian Devotion 67

Holy Week Funeral 68

(*Contents Continued on Next Page*)

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price in U. S. currency or equivalent: United States, Canada, $5.00; Foreign, $5.00; 50 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, November 30, 1944, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

Copyright 1952, by The Catholic University of America Press

(*Contents Continued from Previous Page*)

Transferring the Blessed Sacrament 68
Priest's Wake 69
Candle Difficulty 69
Side Altar Tabernacle 69
Good Friday Permission 70
Another Holy Week Problem 70
Sunday Observance 71
Results of an Invalid Sacrament 72
Attendance at "B" Movies 72

BOOK REVIEWS

Yankee Priest, *by Edward F. Murphy, S.S.J.* 74
The Wisdom of the Talmud, *by Rabbi Ben Zion Bosker* 75
The Gates of Dannemora, *by John Bonn* 79

Subscribe today to

The Catholic Educational Review

A "Must" for Every Catholic School and Educator

- Published under the direction of the Department of Education, The Catholic University of America.
- Monthly from September through June.
- Indexed in The Catholic Periodical Index, The Education Index, and The Guide to Catholic Literature.
- Articles, Abstracts, Notes, News, Book Reviews, Up-to-the-Minute and Practical

Indispensable for every Catholic school and educator

- Elementary, High School, College levels.

Subscription Price: United States, Canada, Foreign $4.00;
Single Number 40c

ADDRESS:
THE CATHOLIC EDUCATIONAL REVIEW
THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA
WASHINGTON 17, D. C.

THE SCHOOL AND THE COMMUNITY*

It is a pleasant duty to welcome the N.C.E.A. again to Kansas City after twelve short, but eventful years. It is forty-three years since I traveled from Portland, Oregon, to Boston to read a paper at your Sixth Annual Meeting (1909). More than thirty years ago I presented a study of Catholic Rural Education to your convention in New York City (1920). As Superintendent of Schools in Portland, as pastor first in a city, then in a country parish, and as Bishop, I have watched with deep interest, but also with pride and admiration, the leadership the N.C.E.A. has given to the cause of Catholic Education in the United States. You have faced with courage and analyzed with intelligence the multitude of obstacles which seemed insurmountable. And if many problems still confront us today, we can face them with greater confidence, both because of the inflexible determination of the Catholic body which you have done so much to develop, and because of the instrumentality of leadership which you have created.

You have assembled as an Association of Catholic Educators, bearing aloft the banner of the Divine Teacher. You have opened your sessions appropriately with solemn Pontifical Mass celebrated by our beloved metropolitan, the Archbishop of St. Louis, and honored by the presence of the ordinaries of the province. Your President-General, the Archbishop of Baltimore, in his eloquent sermon, has set the theme and precised the educational philosophy which will inspire your deliberations. It is now your duty to reduce these ideals and principles to lines of daily custom: to establish the patterns of working school procedures which will tend to make both your ideals and your principles live in the lives of the children and youth committed for a significant period to your care.

As a statement, sufficient for my purpose, of the traditional Catholic philosophy of education, I shall be content with a quotation of two sentences from a recent valuable work on education

* [Editor's note] This paper was read by His Excellency Bishop Edwin V. O'Hara at the General Session of the forty-ninth annual meeting of the National Catholic Education Association at Kansas City.

by Fr. Fergal McGrath: "In common with all educationists," he writes, "Catholics hold that education is a training of the whole man, intellectual and moral. In common with all who accept religious beliefs, they hold that it must include training in these beliefs since they form part, and the highest part, of man's intellectual heritage, and on them morality is founded." Such is the platform of our schools.

We are not long engaged in education however when we learn, to our joy or to our sorrow, that schools are far from being the only agencies of education. It is fitting that this convention has set as its theme, "Education and the Community," for the community itself challenges the school for primacy in the educational process. Who can weigh the influence of the neighborhood, of the gang, of recreational facilities, of the cinema and now T.V. in the education of youth, either for good or evil? But there is certainly one force in the community with which the school must join hands if it is not to be hopelessly frustrated. I refer to the parents of the pupils, and I speak of them for reasons both of principle and of policy.

PARENTAL OBLIGATIONS

In the Catholic philosophy of education the parental right and duty come first. Our Supreme Court gave voice to a legal maxim singularly in harmony with religious concepts, when in the Oregon School case, it ruled that parents have a claim prior to the State; "a right coupled with the high duty" to direct the education of their children. The Catholic Church goes further in this direction. The right and duty of religious education rests directly with the parents. By the sacrament of Marriage, God gives grace to husband and wife to enable them to perform this duty towards their children. This is a sacramental grace not given to Bishops or Priests or Brothers or Sisters, but to parents in the sublime sacrament of marriage. Let parents stir up within their souls the graces received in Christian marriage and they will not be wanting as Christian educators. I need not be told that many parents are not qualified by natural endowments of training for this task. I presume there are few of us who do not have duties, for the performance of which we must seek the aid of others. So it is with parents. They call the school to their aid—but the responsibility before God rests primarily with the

parents, and only in the second place with the school. A great deal of the failure of education stems from the eagerness of school men to accept, nay to claim, full responsibility for the education of youth. Such an assumption, dangerous and reprehensible in secular education, is particularly inexcusable in religious schools which teach such an exalted philosophy of marriage and family life.

As I have said, the failure to enlink the parents in the ambient of the school is a double error. First, it permits the home to become a rival instead of an aid: to become a liability in the education process by its absorption in wordliness, thus contradicting everything the Catholic school is commissioned by the Church to teach. Secondly, it neglects to employ the tremendous reserves of intelligence and good will of which our Christian families are the treasury.

I am no pessimist as I look out on the world today. I can hardly be accused of ignorance of the sin and misery and injustice which threaten to engulf us. But I know thousands of Catholic homes in which parents are fulfilling the obligations of Christian wedlock in a manner never excelled, if indeed ever equaled by so large a body of homes, in any period of history. If I know of the sin and worldliness of our times, I also know of the remedy given under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit by the action of the Blessed Pius X in opening to children and adults access to the Bread of Life in early and frequent Communion. In my own lifetime I have seen the transformation that has been wrought in Catholic family life, despite the multiplied allurements of worldliness. We have a Pilot who governs the winds and the waves: "Why are you fearful, O ye of little faith?" Let not our schools be afraid to associate intimately with themselves the fathers and mothers (for fathers are parents also) of such families in the mutual work of educating their children. Invaluable assistance in effecting this co-operation will be found in the Parent-Teacher Association.

THE CHILD

It would, however, be an inadequate analysis that would vindicate for teachers and parents the whole process of education. There is one other party whose co-operation is obviously essential —namely, the child himself. Education does not consist merely in

the imparting of certain subject matter. Education is essentially the child's growth in a sense of personal responsibility for the use of his time, talents, capacities and opportunities, both natural and supernatural. Thus, the chief function of the teacher of youth is guidance and the end of guidance is the achievement of the power of self-guidance by the growing boy and girl. Education cannot be imposed on the pupil; "his books and teachers are but helps—the work is his."

The child is a person, a unique responsible being, who is not so much to be sheltered as to be wisely exposed to the making of vital choices. For this he must be led to know his powers and capabilities, as well as his goal. He must be led to study himself as well as an array of text-books. It was this consideration that led Newman to agree with Dr. Pusey that "the work of the professor is not by itself sufficient to form the pupil"—and to add "the principal making of men must be by the tutorial system." That is to say that the school must be organized to give the pupil guidance in the wide field of personal development. It must not only excel in imparting a knowledge of subject matter in the various branches—but must lead the pupil to view this knowledge in relation to his own vocation as a human being, a member of society and a Christian.

READING

In the matter of acquiring knowledge, since the days of Gutenberg, the chief tool is reading—a capacity which involves the mind in its control of the eye, the lips and the ear. (And in the case of the blind, also of the sense of touch.) It requires the development of a power of concentration to get the meaning out of the written word. In the present exploitation of the visual arts, in the flicker of the moving film, the school has a competitor which may even be a hostile neighbor, and if taken into intimate partnership, must, like the tongue, which Scripture describes as "an unruly member"—learn when to be silent. There are so many wonderful things about visual education which seem to make learning easy, one might be led to overlook the fact that the highest type of visual power is the power to read—to get the message from the printed page—to understand and interpret the mind of the author through his written word. *This is the one function of the elementary school, the neglect of which is the betrayal*

of a trust. Competent reading ability is the key that opens the doors and the shelves of all libraries of knowledge. In the one room ungraded country school, where the teacher struggled with fifty pupils between the ages of five and fifteen, I learned in geography that somewhere on the terrestrial globe there was a strip of water known as the Straits of Bab-El-Mandeb and I also learned to name the counties of Minnesota by rote, matters of doubtful educational importance—but we learned to read with facility and comprehension the contents of the five graded readers and the supplementary texts provided by the classes in history, civics and hygiene and by our school and home libraries. That was the incomparable contribution of a succession of capable teachers and intelligent parents. That was a long time ago, when the pedagogy of reading was not as well developed as it is today. Many children who were trained to recognize words, one by one, accurately, never acquired the skill to read with facility and satisfaction. Today with our improved knowledge of the technique of developmental reading, we cannot be content merely to put aside the basic tool of learning in the pupil's possession; we must teach him how to use it with fruitfulness and effect.

A SEVEN GRADE ELEMENTARY SYSTEM

The question of the number of years to be devoted to the elementary grades has often engaged the attention of the N.C.E.A. The general conclusion has been that we in America spend more years in the elementary school than is necessary—a year or two more than is allotted in European schools. Kansas City has had long and successful experience with a seven grade elementary system. This was competently attested by a thorough educational survey here some 12 years ago. While the public schools here have changed to an eight grade system during the past few years, we have not been convinced that we should follow their example. It has been demonstrated that Kansas City pupils under the seven grade system were at no disadvantage in entering high school, as compared with children from the eight grade system of other cities in the State, nor later on in entering College or the State University. With the prospect of universal military service, it seems desirable that boys should be able to spend a year in college before being called to the service. Since

the work of the elementary grades has been successfully completed in seven years in the schools here for three-quarters of a century, it seems to us that the change would not only impose an unnecessary financial burden, but be wasteful of a year in the lives of our boys and girls. It might readily be conceded that a terminal eighth grade would serve a useful purpose in communities where a high percentage of the children do not go on to high school. In Kansas City 96 per cent of elementary school graduates have regularly entered high school and have remained in high school a year longer than in comparable cities. In our own Catholic high schools, we have had for several years as many children entering the first year as graduated the previous June from the elementary grades. After a careful weighing of these and other relevant considerations, we are continuing the seven grade system in our schools.

HIGH SCHOOLS FOR BOYS AND GIRLS

It was the stimulus received from the N.C.E.A. Convention held here twelve years ago that encouraged us to provide high school facilities adequate to care for all our Catholic children. In the course of five years from 1940 to 1945, we doubled our high-school facilities and attendance. This was accomplished by the construction of new buildings and the opening in Kansas City of four low-tuition high schools to both boys and girls. This presents a subject which deserves at least a brief discussion. We are asked, are you in favor of co-education? I answer that the question is not so simple as that—nor in my mind is the question of co-education really involved. First of all, the question that confronted us was not whether we would have boys and girls in the same schools, but whether we could finance sufficient high schools and thus provide religious training for all our children. The tuition in our private boys' high schools ten years ago was ten dollars a month. Needless to say, working men's families with several children could not take advantage of Catholic education under these terms. By constructing modern high school buildings in various parts of the city, with the aid of the parishes and under the general supervision of the Diocesan school office, but owned and conducted by several religious Communities of women, it was foreseen that the tuition could be greatly reduced if ample attendance could be secured. The opening of

these schools to both boys and girls was the only hope of securing the desired attendance. The new high schools, beginning ten years ago with a monthly tuition of three dollars, were immediately filled and in each case had to be enlarged. With the diminished value of the dollar since 1940, the new high schools find no resistance to a $5.00 a month tuition today. The fear that the low-tuition schools would injure the existing schools has proven unfounded. It is now the customary thing for Catholic children to attend Catholic high schools. We did not choose co-education; we chose to have Catholic schools.

But I should be willing to go further. As I have read the Papal Encyclicals, I find the objection to co-education to be that it gives the same education to boys as to girls—not to the fact that they are educated in day schools under the same roof. After all, boys and girls are reared under the same roof in Christian homes—and our day schools are only an extension of our Catholic homes.

Sex is not merely a physical endowment. The differences between men and women are profoundly psychological as all literature and experience attest. Co-education is reprobated because it tries to make one a copy of the other—to make boys womanish or girls mannish instead of bringing the character of each to its own highest development. Now in our high schools we strive to make manly men and womanly women, not only by providing excellent domestic science courses for the girls and manual training for the boys, but by a hundred differentiating measures in the curriculum, as well as diverse projects in the course of their personal, educational, social and occupational program of guidance. They are not being co-educated. There is in our schools no attempt to realize the poet's evil dream of "raising the woman's fallen divinity upon an equal pedestal with man."

After 30 years of experience with Catholic day high schools, with mixed attendance of boys and girls, I can confidently bear witness that disciplinary problems arising from the presence of the two sexes is not one of their major problems. The same conclusion was reached by a distinguished churchman and educator, rightly reverenced by this association. It is well known that long years of observation led Archbishop McNicholas to

reverse his earlier view and to adopt from his own experience a position with which I was happy to find myself in complete accord.

I wish to issue a caveat against the easy assumption that what I have said militates universally against the desirability of separate schools for boys and girls. To vindicate the thoroughly Catholic spirit of the mixed school under the conditions we have been considering does not require one to be blind to advantages which may well be associated with schools in which the sexes are separately educated.

THE RELIGIOUS TEACHING COMMUNITY

We have been considering the school and the community in several aspects. I should be derelict to an obligation of hospitality as well as blind to a central feature of our Catholic schools in America if I were to close without speaking of the Catholic Schools and the religious Community—the Community with a capital "C."

The United States is the only important country in the world, outside the Soviet bloc, which rigorously prohibits the teaching of religion in schools supported by public taxation. I think this is the least creditable feature of our government. We toss billions around for every conceivable project, but refuse to hear the call of Jesus Christ who asks that the little children be permitted to come to Him.

As the immediate and most striking consequence of this secularistic attitude we find that the only extensive system of religious schools in America is made possible by associations of teachers who have the vow of poverty. There seems to be a provision in nature that every sickness tends to evoke a corresponding antidote and remedy. Religious Education in America, denied the consideration rendered by every other free government, has elicited the most incredible response from hundreds of thousands of apostolic men and women. These dedicated teachers have chosen to be poor with Christ that they may give to the children that precious spiritual inheritance which the richest nation in the world denies them. What a treasure of faith and hope and love these hundreds of religious Communities have vowed to the Christian Education of four million children and

youth." We rejoice in the spirit of your various congregations drawn from the inspiration of your holy founders. Therein lies your strength. Cherish and preserve that spirit. It is your patrimony and priceless inheritance.

May your numbers increase and your pupils be multiplied to profit by your guidance and the example of your sacrifice. The N.C.E.A. is the expression of your service for the half of the Catholic children in America who are in the schools where you teach and of your hopes for all of them. For them your consecrated labors are an everlasting benediction; for them the resources of our parishes are poured forth without stint.

You will not expect me to fail to mention the other half who are dependent on the crumbs that fall from our tables. For them I desiderate that you will train a Christian generation and form them as lay apostles in the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine. Thus your heart will be enlarged—your vision widened and the reach of your arm extended to guide the steps of other millions now denied a Catholic education.

✠ EDWIN V. O'HARA, D.D.
Bishop of Kansas City

THE INFLUENCE OF THE PRIEST

The priest who has the grace of real personal influence invites trust and pledges his admirers to generous consecration to the law of God and the spirit of His holy service. Personal influence is the soul of all sympathetic leadership in the world. We look up toward men thus gifted, eager to obey them, glad to be advised by them, grateful when taught of them. The people know that when doubt harasses them, release is sure if they can but lean on such a priest. They know that when hard battles with temptation must be fought and the standard of spiritual integrity is in danger, the views of such a priest or even the thought of him will turn the tide of battle and give promise of victory. Wisdom, decision, skill in charting pathways through spiritual mazes are among the gifts that heaven gives to a priest of this type.

—Msgr. Kerby, in "The Personal Influence of the Priest," in *AER*, LV, 4 (Oct., 1916), 354.

WANTED: "SHOE-LEATHER" APOSTLES

When Christ saw Peter and Andrew casting a net into the Sea of Galilee, He said to them: "Come ye after me, and I will make you to be fishers of men." In those words the divine Master disclosed the essential nature of the priestly calling—the seeking for souls, the fishing for men.

Christ's whole ministry was the manifestation of a quenchless thirst for souls, a ceaseless driving hunger for the sheep which had strayed away—a hunger that was rendered vocal in those pleading words to His Apostles: "And other sheep I have, that are not of this fold; them also I must bring, and they shall hear My voice, and there shall be one fold and one shepherd." It was this same yearning which found its reverberation in the Master's prayer preceding His Passion, when He said: "Yet not for these only do I pray, but for those also who through their word are to believe in Me, that all may be one, even as Thou, Father, in Me, and I in Thee."

Varied and numerous indeed are the duties that crowd in upon the pastor of souls in America. He is the builder of churches and schools, the teacher of his flock, the spiritual physician ministering to the sick, the dispenser of the mysteries of God, the administrator of the temporalities of the parish. Yet it is doubtful if there is any form of his ministry which expresses more accurately the dominant note of the priestly calling than the quest for a sheep which has strayed outside the fold. And he will search for it until he finds it. Then, rescuing it from the thorns and briars amid which it has become entangled, he will take it in his arms and pressing it to his bosom will carry it back to the fold.

That is the shepherd after the heart of Christ who came not to call the just but sinners to repentance. He wants all His children to be members of the one flock under the supreme Shepherd and Pastor of souls, the Bishop of Rome, the Vicar of Christ on earth. Hence, the chief task of His disciples is to bring all men into the one true fold where they will be nourished with the fruits of the Redemption.

A WHITE HARVEST

As an indication of this fact, Christ refers to His priests as fishers of men and shepherds of souls. He also indicates that they are to be reapers. When He stood at Jacob's Well and saw the crowd of Samaritans approaching Him, He turned to His disciples and said: "Do not you say, 'There are yet four months, and then the harvest cometh?' Behold, I say to you: lift up your eyes, and see the countries: for they are white already to harvest. And he that reapeth, receiveth wages, and gathereth fruit unto life everlasting."

The harvest of which the Master spoke was not the harvest of wheat or oats or rye: it was the precious harvest of human souls. Christ wished to sharpen the vision of the disciples and fire their imagination so they would see in the approaching throng a part of that vast harvest which He had come upon earth to gather.

By means of all these vivid and expressive figures of speech the divine Master makes it unmistakably clear that the essential objective of the priestly ministry is the *winning of souls* for God.

True, they are to teach and administer sacraments. "Going therefore," He said, "teach ye all nations; baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you. And behold, I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world." But the purpose of the teaching and the administration of the sacraments is to help persons in the saving of their souls. Thus the over-all objective of the priestly ministry is seen to be the winning of souls. Every action which leads to that goal fits into the pattern of the sacerdotal office: any action which impedes the attainment of that divinely appointed task has no place in the life of a priest.

Like his divine Master, the true priest must have a burning thirst for souls. Ever before his eyes must be the momentous words of Christ: "What doth it profit a man if he gain the whole world, but suffer the loss of his own soul?" The human soul is the most priceless treasure in all creation. There is nothing of equal value for which it can be exchanged. The saving of one's soul is then the supreme objective of every creature. The mission of the priest is to assist him in that all-important enterprise.

The zeal that prompted Ignatius Loyola to found the Society of Jesus and that animated his whole priestly life was a consuming zeal for souls. This is reflected in his constant prayer: "Give me souls, O Lord, give me only souls." Such, too, must be the hourly ejaculation of every true priest.

A MEMORABLE VISIT

Some thirty years ago I was driving up to the north woods when I found myself passing a church in Eau Claire, Wisconsin. I stopped to say Mass. The pastor was a kindly, grey haired priest who after Mass invited me in for breakfast. His name was Fr. A. B. C. Dunne.

"Father," he said, "I wish you could have been here last Sunday."

"Why," I asked, "what was taking place?"

"The bishop was here . . . he insisted that we have a little celebration to mark the reception of the thousandth convert I was privileged to receive into the Church."

My eyes opened in astonishment.

"A thousand converts!" I exclaimed. "Congratulations! That is indeed an army large enough to make a good-sized parish or two. How in the world did you manage to win so many?"

"I conduct an Inquiry Class that meets two nights a week . . . every week in the year. At the end of three months of instruction, most of the members ask to be received into the Church. I tell them that the best way in which they can show their gratitude to Almighty God for the gift of faith is to share their faith with others . . . to bring a non-Catholic relative or friend to the next Inquiry Class. In this way additional prospects are recruited and my classes are well attended."

"Do lay people," I ventured, "recruit all the prospects for you?"

"No, not all," he replied, "they bring a goodly number but both my assistant and I recruit quite a few. Every year we make a house-to-house canvass and discover a number who have no church affiliation and who accept our invitation to attend our Information Forum which we also call an Inquiry Class. Most non-Catholics are delighted to see that a Catholic priest is enough

interested in them to call upon them. Some do not come after the first call. But we continue to visit them, wherever possible, and a friendship is formed. Then, the first thing you know, they are coming to our Inquiry Class. Apparently God designed friendship as the bridge which leads from indifferentism to faith."

"That bridge is paved with shoe leather, isn't it, Father?"

"Yes," he said, "it means wearing out a lot of shoe leather to round up a thousand prospects. I spend from one to two hours a day, floating around the parish, calling on new families that have moved into the neighborhood, whether they are Catholics or not. They appreciate such friendly calls. A friendship results and virtually every conversion begins with a friendship. That's the way God draws souls to Him and I try to make each friendship serve as a channel for divine grace. If we do our part, God won't fail to do His."

"Recruiting prospects for instruction," I inquired, "might be called the 'shoe-leather Apostolate', mightn't it?"

"Yes," he laughed, "there are no souls won for Christ by sitting at home, wearing out the upholstery on overstuffed chairs. One has to go out after them, look for them, day in and day out, in season and out of season. Christ called us to be fishers of men and that's what I try to do each day. It takes some patience and persistence but it's the greatest fun in the world and the source of the greatest joy in the life of a priest."

"Do people like to receive instruction in a group?" I asked.

"They love it," Fr. Dunne replied. "They feel more at ease . . . it's less strenuous than if an individual were the sole target of my oratory. Then they are encouraged by the interest which the others show, and they get to feel they don't want to be left out of a good thing. I avoid anything like a school-room atmosphere by encouraging them to light their pipes and cigarettes and relax, while I do the work. We always manage to have a couple of good laughs during the evening . . . they get to know one another quite well . . . and finally I have to shoo the stragglers home."

"Do you instruct all your converts by the group method?" I inquired.

"No, there are always a few who can't come in the evening, and I take them during the day . . . singly . . . and in twos or threes.

But I encourage everyone who can possibly arrange to attend the Inquiry Class to do so. I tell them they will like it better and ask them to give it a trial. Once they attend, and see the friendly atmosphere where all are relaxed and feel at home, they are 'sold' on the Inquiry Class and prefer it to private instruction.

"They realize," he continued, "that they are not consuming so much of my time and hence they will feel free, as I want them to feel, to make their own decision at the end of the course. I tell them to pray all during the course and God will help them to make the right decision."

He showed me a number of graphs which he had cut out of the U. S. Religious Census to show the members of his class the distribution of Catholics and their percentage of the religious population in the various States. It helped to bring out the universality of the Church and to show it to be the Church of all people . . . everywhere. He talked with great interest of his convert work and I could see that it was the consuming passion of his priestly life.

About two hours later three women, apparently housewives, some with their knitting, came for instruction, bringing our visit to a reluctant close.

It was an eye-opener for me. It brought the "convert movement" out of the skies and showed me the endless possibilities of winning souls for Christ if one but fling his net with vigor and courage into the deep.

The memory haunted me and a few years later when I was compiling *The White Harvest*, a book on convert techniques, I turned to him for a chapter describing his methods of recruiting and of instructing converts.

Before he had time to complete his story, death stilled his busy hand and questing heart. But Fr. C. E. Dowd, his assistant for many years and later his successor, had learned his methods so thoroughly and used them so successfully that he was able to carry the story to completion and thus help hundreds of priests in the important art of winning souls.

A DIOCESAN CAMPAIGN

Recently, I was privileged to assist Bishop Buddy of San Diego in launching a diocesan-wide campaign for souls. The aim was to

enlist every family in every parish in the Christ-like work of sharing their most precious treasure, the holy Catholic Faith, with their friends and neighbors. It was high time, the bishop felt, to summon the laity to take their place by the side of their pastor in the crusade to win souls for Christ.

Thousands of Catholic lay men and women joined with their spiritual leaders in calling at every home and extending a cordial invitation to the family to attend an Information Forum where the truths of the Catholic religion are explained and the divine character of our Faith is made unmistakably clear. There is every indication that the annual total of converts in that diocese will be doubled and perhaps tripled. And the campaign is to continue, year after year.

During that crusade I spoke to the students at the Immaculate Heart Seminary in El Cajon on the role of the priest as a fisher of men. Young, enthusiastic and zealous, they were eager to learn how they could win the most copious draft of souls for Christ. There follows a summary of what I said to the seminarians in California.

KEY TO SUCCESS

To be a worthy priest of Jesus Christ one must, of course, be a man of prayer, of deep faith and of genuine holiness. Assuming that the young priest possesses those fundamental qualities, essential for every priest, he must then acquire some insight into the methods which have proven effective in winning converts. This job can be broken down into its two constituent elements: recruiting prospects and instructing them.

Other things being equal, the most successful insurance salesman is the man who calls on the largest number of prospects. Likewise, the priest who personally calls upon the largest number of prospects or who arranges to have his parishioners recruit them for him will win the largest number of souls for Christ. Even where lay people are generous in giving their time and energy to the work of calling upon prospects, the priest should set the example by calling at a reasonable number of homes. He should be the leader in this divine enterprise and show that he is summoning his parishioners to do only that which he himself is willing to do. Example speaks louder than words and there can be no substitute for it.

The key to success in the instruction of converts is compounded of kindness, fairness, courtesy and scholarship—and the most important of all is kindness. Converts are rarely, if ever, won by an irascible and crotchety priest, no matter how erudite he may be. Kindness wins their hearts, causes them to open their minds and helps them to see the truth. Unkindness is like a blast of chilling wind which blows out the candle of their incipient interest and fills their souls with darkness.

There is an abundance of good books of instruction. They have proven their effectiveness in the hands of thousands of priests. Follow such a manual carefully; have the inquirers read it; explain and illustrate it in the class lecture. Encourage all to read a supplementary book to deepen and enlarge their background. It is a great mistake to assume that people can't read, or don't relish reading, and that the entire burden of instruction must be placed upon one's vocal cords.

It is unseemly to place in their hands a child's penny catechism or its equivalent when there are books which present every answer in the catechism with explanations suitable for adults. Good books are our best allies and we should encourage every member of a class to read at least two such books in addition to a suitable prayer book. This will get him started in the formation of a habit which will stand him in good stead through the years and will immensely deepen his understanding of his faith and the fruitfulness of its practice, namely, the habit of reading Catholic literature. It is this habit which will make him articulate in explaining his faith and prepare him for his role in the Apostolate of winning souls.

One of the most important single rules for candidates for the pastoral ministry to make is this: "Upon ordination I shall spend at least two hours daily, except Sunday, in looking up converts and in searching for the sheep that have strayed from the Master's fold." Only by such an active shoe-leather Apostolate will people be won for Christ. Remaining in the rectory, aloof from the people, wearing out the seat of an overstuffed chair and waiting for an occasional prospect to ring the doorbell and request instruction can mean only continued drifting and leakage, estrangement of the masses from the Church, the

growth of anti-clericalism and the deadly downward path of decadence and decay.

SECRET OF SUCCESS

At the end of the talk the seminarians rose in a body and eagerly repeated the words of the following pledge: "I solemnly promise on my word of honor to devote at least two hours each day of my priestly life, except Sunday, in calling at homes to invite people to attend the Information Forum which I shall conduct twice a week throughout the year to reclaim the sheep that have strayed from the Master's fold. So help me God! This promise I seal with the Sign of the Cross: In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Amen."

The sound of those eager young voices is echoing like music in my ears. In unfaltering and loving compliance with that commitment, these young athletes of Christ will find each day of the priestly ministry replete with challenge, adventure and daring for God and souls. Theirs will be no humdrum existence, no mere mechanical routine. They will live in no ivory tower but close to the flock entrusted to them; in that flock are all the people, Catholic or non-Catholic, who reside within the territory of their parish. They will find that constant friendly contact with souls is not only the main channel through which God sends His grace, including the gift of faith, but it is also intensely gratifying and a never failing stimulant of zeal and devotion.

Along this path of tireless missionary efforts to extend God's kingdom in the souls of men lies the hope of the Church in America. By plunging our net, like Peter and his fellow Apostles, fearlessly and persistently into the deep we shall catch a copious draft of souls for the Master. By a ministry, marked by such courage, faith and zeal, we shall win the people of America for Christ. By being fishers of men, day in and day out, in season and out of season, we shall win America and ultimately the world for Christ.

The priesthood is the greatest vocation in the world. It is not a glamorous one that leads over the roseate paths of pleasure and ease to the limelight of prominence and applause. It is a life of prayer, penance and self-denial, wherein is sacrificed the possibility of a home and children—perhaps the greatest sacrifice of

all. It is a life hidden in Christ, wherein one seeks not his own glory but that of his divine Master; but it is a life rich in spiritual consolations and rewards. To certain chosen souls among the bravest and the best of the youth of our land Christ is still saying: "Come ye after me . . . The harvest indeed is great but the laborers are few."

JOHN A. O'BRIEN

University of Notre Dame
Notre Dame, Indiana

FIFTY YEARS AGO

The leading article in *The American Ecclesiastical Review* for May, 1902, entitled "Training Preachers in the Seminary," is contributed by a writer who signs himself "A Seminary Professor." He is so convinced of the importance of interest in singing and preaching on the part of clerical students that he does not hesitate to assert that the students should understand that "no man will be called to orders who has not, during his seminary career, made decidedly conscientious efforts to become as good a preacher and as good a singer as his natural powers will enable him to be". . . . Fr. Thomas Hughes, S.J., contributes from Rome an article on "A Maryland Marriage Question: A.D. 1713." It is a description of two eighteenth-century documents, preserved in the library of Stonyhurst College, England, written by two Jesuits, one of whom was a missionary in the colony of Maryland. Both writers defend the proposition that, in view of the number of marriages taking place in the colony between baptized persons and unbaptized Quakers and Negroes, it would be preferable if the impediment of disparity of cult were prohibitive rather than diriment. . . . Fr. M. J. Lagrange, O.P., writing on "Ten Years in Palestine," describes the principal discoveries made in the Holy Land in the course of the past decade. . . . Fr. V. McNabb, O.P., writes eloquently and sympathetically on the Oxford Movement, recognizing as a contemporary successor of Newman and Ward the author of *England and the Holy See*, Mr. Spencer Jones. . . . In the Conference section the readers are reminded that on Friday, May 9, a Novena in honor of the Holy Ghost should begin in every parish church, in compliance with the command of Pope Leo XIII in his Encyclical *Divinum illud munus* (May 9, 1897): "We decree and command that throughout the entire Catholic world a nine days' devotion begin in preparation for the feast of Pentecost, this year and every year hereafter, for all time to come, in every parish church."

F.J.C.

THE STUDY OF HISTORY AND CLERICAL EDUCATION

The increasing depth of American history study makes more evident that even the American cannot read first-hand all the documents important for understanding the present development and position of the United States. The current controversy over the relations between Church and State and the constant appeals to historic documents are added proofs that the educated clergyman of today must be well grounded in history, and that history means not merely ancient, patristic, or mediaeval history but also modern world history and American history. If the Catholic clergyman is to function properly as pastor and teacher he must not be dependent upon the weekly pictorial magazines or the partisan press for his information about the past.

The problem of giving our young cleric a proper grounding in history is twofold. One problem is the acqusition of a fund of accurate historical information. The other is the learning at least the beginnings of a technique of historical study which will enable the future pastor and teacher to keep abreast of the progress in historical knowledge. The acquisition of historical information implies that the student learns who the best writers are and reads them as much as his situation permits.

At one time the reading of the classic narratives of Greece and Rome seemed to give adequate knowledge of ancient history, but today, even when these classics are studied with traditional scholarship, they are primarily mental discipline and literary studies. The real study of the history of Greece and Rome must include the best of the recent balanced narratives which incorporate the centuries of research into the government, religion, art, and home life of the ancient world. Also an adequate appreciation of the classical literature, whether philosophic or poetic, calls for a historical background, and that historical background includes some knowledge of the ancient world outside Greece and Rome. Even the original classical narratives gain by such historical introductions.

So also the critical scholarship of recent centuries has given the Western world a clearer comprehension of the world of early

Christianity, of the age of the migration of the nations, and of the rise of the feudal institutions of mediaeval Europe. If the clergyman wishes to speak knowingly of the famed mediaeval world, he should supplement his knowledge of the age of transition from ancient Rome to Christendom with readings in available documents of these years and in the entrancing essays of Rand, Dawson, Pirenne, Haskins and the like. Readings only of St. Thomas in the original texts or of the lives of the saints can prevent the young theologian from grasping the fact that Aquinas was once rejected or that much superstition existed amidst the faith of the Middle Ages.

The mediaeval world was not a perfect age in which all people lived in faith and harmony or in which the Church met no opposition. There were good men and bad, wars and brigandage as well as saints and scholars. Not only was Aquinas' philosophy once condemned, there was a John XII as well as an Innocent III in the papal succession, and the requirement of an annual communion was enacted to meet a need. The desire to offset the unfair and unhistoric generalizations of Protestantism or the bitter criticisms of a Coulton about the Middle Ages has led to glorifications in some rhetorical writings that are in turn unhistorical. The real stories of the cathedrals, of the universities, and of the conflict between empire and Church which changed gradually into the modern world of the Protestant revolt and the humanistic revival may not fit into easy generalizations but they afford a deep understanding of the modern world and of modern continuations of age-old struggles. Despite the increased tempo of the modern industrial world there is a remarkable consistency between the histories of the thirteenth and twentieth centuries. And one might point out here that the concepts of feudalism and of the mediaeval empire need careful historical delineation before they are introduced into the current controversy over the relations between Church and State.

Perhaps even more important to the present day conflict of ideas is an intelligent history of the so-called enlightenment, of the rise of the bourgeois democracies, of the development of modern commerce, and of the rise of modern capitalism which will lay aside some of these philosophical prejudices and deal with actual developments. The sad day of the Church persecuted and betrayed during the early modern era until the Catholic renais-

sance of the nineteenth century must be known by the educated man who wishes to understand humanistically the economic, political and social institutions of the twentieth century. On the brighter side of the picture, the rise of modern Catholic social and intellectual movements which have accompanied the Catholic renaissance in western Europe cannot be judged except in the nationalistic, imperialistic, and rationalistic currents in which they were formed. Political and social revolution, emancipation political and religious, the *Syllabus*, *Rerum novarum*, and many other events are part of a complicated but important story from which most religious, economic, and political arguments draw their proofs. Too often there has been no Catholic voice in the arguments about the conflict of cultures in the public forum and especially in the universities, with the result that our popular and semi-popular magazines are filled with erroneous and false historical premises. To trace the history of the Church through the so-called enlightenment and the nineteenth century revolutions is not easy but the result is satisfying to the mind that is repelled by the secularistic trend in the American press.

Neither have Catholics been prominent in American historical scholarship. In our own history there have been many missionaries since Fr. Stephen Theodore Badin and many bishops since John Carroll. There have always been Catholic citizens who participated in the policy debates of our Republic and the American heritage of political freedom and economic opportunity has been the beacon that brought Catholic immigrants to the United States. The fact that Catholic philosophy or Catholic dogma have never been dominant in the United States should not cause Catholics to forget the Carrolls, Judge Gaston, the Spaldings, Orestes A. Brownson, Ireland, Gibbons and many others who have kept alive and growing the Catholic traditions of the nation. Besides contributing their share to the common American heritage they helped to give a sound interpretation of that heritage. The reading of official documents and the study of the lives of our American leaders offer sound proofs that recent secularist and anti-religious attacks on American institutions are contrary to the American tradition.

The garnering of these historical facts must in the nature of things be apportioned to the various stages of clerical training and calls for a more serious approach to the teaching and study of

history. There is no justifiable defense for a policy that would permit the product of our minor seminaries to be less well informed in these matters than the graduates of secular high schools. Against the pragmatic tendency in some secular institutions, especially against the trend to substitute a pragmatic social study for the traditional history, there is even a greater need for the intelligent study of history in the training program of priests who will have to preach and teach against this relativism which has false history as its basic dogma. In the study of the history of western Europe it is no longer sufficient to know only the factors that favored the growth of the Church. In a world no longer dominated by a Christian tradition, it is necessary to understand also the economic and political factors which have made the history of the Church so complicated, especially in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. If history is to be taught in the seminary it must not be a caricature, a few names to illustrate dogmatic theology, but a serious study taught by men trained in the historical disciplines. And the seminary reading lists and libraries must include more than textbooks.

More important than the knowledge of history of these past ages is the acquisition of that approach to the past which can be considered the discipline of history. This discipline consists primarily in the critical use of documents. History without documents is simply rhetoric. The sweeping generalization, so easy for the mind trained in philosophical argument, can have validity in history only for the unscholarly. The historical approach demands factual and concrete proof even when the general conclusion is warranted. And there can be no better historian than the truly Catholic scholar whose confidence in ultimate truth enables him to sift and to accept all demonstrable fact in fullest sense of real historical scholarship.

It is true that the ordinary seminary course offers little opportunity to read all the original documents of the history of our Greco-Roman world. Only a few of the classic writings can be read and perhaps even fewer of the documents of the mediaeval world can be examined, although the growing collection of edited and translated mediaeval documents offers a new opportunity in the teaching and study of Church history. Language barriers in modern history are an even greater handicap to the study of nineteenth and twentieth century witnesses. Yet it can safely be

said that some contemporary documents are now available for nearly every period of history, if not in extensive volumes at least in small selections.

Equally important for the learning of history is the reading of the great historians. The same critical faculty that enables the research student to choose between the forgery and the authentic document must be trained to choose between the real historian and the propagandist, between the qualified writer in his field and the generalizer who is ignorant of the documents. In no field of study is the art of critical reading and extensive reading so important as in history. The historical scholar reads not merely to find someone who agrees with him or someone who writes well. He reads his historians to find out what they have to offer in the way of truth and what evidence they can produce to support their statements. The clerical student who has had a good training in history knows well the chief writers and the chief documents from which the accepted history has been compiled. The historical bibliography, not glanced at and forgotten, but understood, is an essential tool for the scholarly seminarian and priest.

Finally there is the ultimate in the study of history. History, like all forms of knowledge, is of no use unless it can be expressed in the words of the student. To read history without trying to express what one learned either orally or, preferably, in writing, results usually in disordered and undisciplined historical thinking. Not everything one learns in history can be committed to writing, but in every field in which one desires to speak there must be careful and critical expression. This careful and accurate expression can usually be learned only in the historical essay in which searched-for and sifted information is re-formed according to the tested knowledge and the scholarly perspective of the student. This historical information should also be carefully correlated with scriptural, dogmatic and philosophical information.

One field of seminary and priestly training in which correct historical training has become indispensible is that of apologetics, either in its popular or in its technical sense. Studying history and acquiring a historical approach to reality is not a cure-all for the embarrassing habit of trying to generalize and philosophize on the basis of doubtful particular facts. Historical training, however, should teach our clergymen that men are individuals

and free and that the rationalization can be true in general but false in fact.

The historian is taught that he can make a statement about a man's action in the past, whether he be Pope, king, priest, alderman or the village miller only if he has the evidence that this action did or did not take place. The effect of trying to prove scientifically and to state exactly what St. Francis said or what Daniel O'Connell did may be humiliating but it is the best way to learn how cheap and valueless are the vague generalizations that fill so many pages of oratory. This exercise if practiced intensely in the seminary and occasionally in priestly study will give us unchallengeable information and a critical ability in reading and expression that gives power to our words. It is the best cure for those faulty generalizations about Spain, about the Inquisition, about the Founding Fathers, which are impossible to defend against concrete historical fact. It is the best defense against half truths which are only half historical.

Teachers of history have been appalled by the lack of interest shown by Catholic students in the history of the Church. They are content to accept oft-repeated secularist claims that the Church is but a relic of the Middle Ages, that modern industrial life has done away with all past traditions. With such claims as premises, these youths cannot well defend their present Catholic faith. The only cure for these heresies is careful instruction in historical truth.

To teach history well and intelligently in the seminary does not mean that the philosophy or literature in the minor seminary or the dogma or moral theology or canon law in the major seminary should be neglected. Those studies constantly refer to history and history depends upon them. A history that is ineptly or uncritically taught is not history; it is a form of blindness imposed on unsuspecting students who frequently stumble later into serious pitfalls in public discussion. History cannot be well taught unless these other subjects are also well taught and clerical training that does not include sound historical discipline is seriously deficient.

THOMAS T. MCAVOY, C.S.C.

THE PURPOSE OF THE MISSIONS: COMMENT ON A REPLY

This is written in Korea, under conditions not conducive to the composition of theological essays. This circumstance will, I trust, explain the tardiness of the following answer to the article by Fr. Edward J. Murphy, S.J., entitled "'The Purpose of the Missions': A Reply" in the September, 1951, issue of the *Review*.

Fr. Murphy, able and zealous writer on missions, rallies to the support of his former professor, Fr. Pierre Charles, S.J., whose theory on the primary purpose of missions I contested in the April, 1951, issue of the *Review*. Fr. Murphy replies, he says, by "trying to clarify the issue."

I am not questioning the soundness of much that Fr. Murphy writes when I remark that what he clarifies is not the issue. He argues, moreover, against positions that I do not hold.

The issue is the primary purpose of missions. Fr. Charles says, clearly, that it is not the salvation of souls. He says, clearly, that missions are not primarily a work of charity. Fr. Murphy admits that this is Fr. Charles' view. Apparently he adheres to it himself, though with "limitations."

This view I contested. I quoted authorities and presented arguments against it. Fr. Murphy's observations fail to prove Fr. Charles' theory, fail to invalidate my case against it.

I suggest that the best clarification is to stick to that one issue.

Since Fr. Murphy, however, has referred to the background of my article, it may be well to tell it more fully.

The article was written in August, 1943, and accepted then for publication in the *Review*. It was written in response to what Fr. Charles had written, and his disciples had re-stated, in several countries, over a period of some seventeen years. During that time I had watched his theory becoming a vogue, and watched it with misgivings that I expressed in various ways. (Something from Fr. Murphy's pen may well have been the occasion of my setting down my reasons against the theory in this article. Or a new development may have been the occasion of both his writing and mine.)

The Second World War was then in progress. Two sagacious missionary leaders felt that a published controversy on the theology of missions would be untimely, when missions were struggling for bare survival and practical problems were uppermost. They asked me to have my article withheld for the time being. I conveyed the request to the Editor of the *Review*, who had the type, already set, broken up.

In manuscript form, however, the article was read by a number of persons, Fr. Murphy among them.

Several years after the war, when some other writing along parallel lines had been published, it was felt that there was no reason against publication of the article. It appeared in the *Review* in 1951, just as it was first written, the only addition being the footnote on p. 287. (The reminder on p. 276 that the *Dossiers de l'action missionnaire* by Fr. Charles are not scientific theological publications, is part of the original text. So is the statement that "his thesis is, however, sufficiently clear for serious debate.")

Now for Fr. Murphy's reply:

(1) It is unnecessary for him to tell us that "we must assume that he [Fr. Charles] would not deny any dogma." The fact that Fr. Charles is a priest of recognized piety, learning and talent, does not exempt all his theories from criticism. My criticism does not reflect on his orthodoxy any more than his objections reflect on the orthodoxy of those who hold other views about missions.

(2) Fr. Murphy's discussion of subjective "motivation" is, of course, quite sound; but it is not an answer to my article, which is about the purpose of the missions in themselves. Right at the start I stated the issue most explicitly: "What is their *finis operis?*" Throughout the article this is the subject; the *"raison d'être* of the missions," the "fundamental reasons for missions," the "purpose of the missions," as expressed by Fr. Charles, on one hand, and as described in official documents on the other. Nowhere, I think, in the article is this *finis operis* confused with the *finis operantis* ("motivation"). My final sentence, which Fr. Murphy quotes, is based on an obvious fact, that motives will tend to follow the *finis operis,* the purpose of the work in itself. A man who resolves to be charitable will seek to do a work that is charitable in itself, even though he can apply the motive of charity to all good actions. A work that is not primarily an act of charity is less likely to appeal to a charitable-minded man than a work that is.

My closing sentence, therefore, merely pointed out a practical consequence of any theory which denies that the primary purpose of missions is the salvation of souls and that the missions are primarily a work of highest charity. One could also point out possible consequences in practical mission policy. But here let us stay with the single key issue.

(3) "When Fr. Charles wrote that the salvation of souls is not the primary purpose of missionary activity," writes Fr. Murphy, "it would be wrong to assume that the salvation of souls in his estimation is not an objective at all in this work."

Emphatically, I did not assume that. I find no trace of such an assumption in my article. I was concerned, and for reasons of clarity, time and space, am still concerned, with only one issue: the primary purpose of the missions.

"It would be arbitrary to say that Fr. Charles makes the salvation of souls secondary," writes Fr. Murphy.

All I can say to that is: according to himself and according to Fr. Murphy, he holds that "the salvation of souls is not the primary purpose of missionary activity."

(4) Fr. Murphy writes: "Fr. O'Connor has taken great care to cite Papal documents all the way back to the early seventeenth century to bolster his idea that the salvation of souls is the specific purpose of missionary activity. He says that the proponents of what he calls a new 'theory' lean most heavily on a text from the Encyclical *Rerum Ecclesiae* of Pius XI."

Fr. Murphy must have read my article hastily. I wrote (p. 287) that "supporters of Fr. Charles' theory have leaned heavily on, etc." Whether they lean more heavily on that text than on some other, I did not say. In my article I wrote consistently about the "primary purpose" of the missions and quoted Fr. Charles on that "primary purpose." Fr. Murphy changes to the word "specific." It is not the same as "primary." For clarity's sake, let's keep the discussion on the "primary purpose." Since Fr. Murphy has brought in the word "specific," however, and built so much of his article on it, I will refer to it later but not in the essential line of argument.

Certainly I took care to cite documents from the Holy See as far back as the records of the Sacred Congregation *de Propaganda Fide* go, which is 1622. I cannot conceive how a theological argu-

ment can be fully presented without such evidence. The farther back it goes, the stronger the case. I likewise quoted from Papal documents of the twentieth century. It is hardly necessary to say that these do not conflict with official statements of earlier periods.

Since my article appeared, a new Encyclical on missions, *Evangelii praecones,* dated June 2, 1951, has been issued by His Holiness Pope Pius XII.

This fine document, like other Encyclicals on the same subject, is dominated throughout by the idea of the conversion and salvation of souls. All missionary methods, including the supreme one of implanting the Church with native personnel, are presented as a means to that end.

The Holy Father quotes Our Lord's words about the white harvest and the fewness of the laborers. Then he says:

> When we consider the countless peoples who are to be called to the one fold and to the one haven of salvation by the preaching of these missionaries, we address to the heavenly Prince of Pastors the words of Ecclesiasticus: "For as Thou hast been sanctified in us in their sight, so shalt Thou be magnified among them in our presence, that they may know Thee, as we also have known Thee, that there is no God beside Thee, O Lord" . . .
>
> Let us remember that our brothers, who "sat in darkness and shadow" are an immense multitude. . . . Thus that ineffable sigh of the most loving Heart of Jesus Christ still seems to echo: "And other sheep I have that are not of this fold; them also I must bring, and they shall hear My voice, and there shall be one fold and one shepherd" . . .
>
> Let him [the missionary] not seek any earthly advantage for his own country or religious institute, but rather what may help towards the salvation of souls . . .
>
> These sacred missions, as all are aware, have as their objective in the first place that the light of Christian truth may shine more brightly on new peoples and that there may be new Christians. However—something that must be always kept in mind—the missions must strive, as towards their last goal, that the Church may be firmly stabilized among other peoples and that its own hierarchy, taken from the native population may be provided for it.[1]

---

[1] In the original, this passage runs: Eo autem, ut omnes norunt, hae sacrae expeditiones primo loco spectant ut Christianae veritatis lumen novis gentibus luculentius affulgeat utque novi habeantur Christiani. Ad illud tamen, extremam veluti metam, contendant necesse est—quod quidem semper

In praising mission-aid organizations, the Holy Father speaks of the children who, under the auspices of the Holy Childhood Society, "pray earnestly for the salvation of the unbelievers." He reminds priests everywhere that what the faithful do "for the salvation of the unbelievers" helps to strengthen their own faith. In thanking clergy and faithful for increased donations to the missions, the Pontiff says:

> Your charity can certainly be devoted to no better cause, since it is thus destined to spread the Kingdom of Christ and to bring salvation to so many still outside the Fold. It is the Lord Himself Who "gave . . . to everyone of them commandment concerning his neighbor."

If the Holy Father held that the primary purpose of missions is not the salvation of souls and that the missions are not primarily a work of charity, he could not have worded this Encyclical as he has.

It would have lengthened my first article and this one excessively, to examine the evidence in the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles, the first missionary documents, for the Apostles' view of the primary purpose of missions. I submit that, according to the evidence, they preached, wrote and organized the Church in new centers, with the clear primary purpose of the salvation of souls. The primary purpose of their activities, I believe, was expressed by St. Paul when he declared (*I Cor.* 9:22): "I became all things to all men *that I might save all.*"

Now I digress somewhat, to comment on the word Fr. Murphy uses so often instead of "primary." He speaks constantly of the "specific purpose" of missions.

To substitute the word "specific" for "primary" creates confusion and partly begs the question. We are actually discussing

---

ante oculos esse debet—ut nempe Ecclesia apud alios populos firmiter constabiliatur, eidemque propria, ex indigenis delecta, tribuatur Hierarchia.

I give this passage because there might be an inclination to cite it in favor of one view or the other. Actually it seems to state the stages and the route of mission progress, from the first conversions to the implanting of a native clergy and hierarchy for the full and permanent reaping of the harvest. I do not quote *primo loco* as explicitly designating the primary purpose of missions, therefore. (In the only English version of this Encyclical I have seen in Korea, that published in the *Catholic Mind* for September, 1951, the words *primo loco* are not rendered by any equivalent.)

whether missions have a specific primary purpose distinct from that of the apostolate elsewhere.

I doubt whether the apostolate in the missions can be distinguished from the apostolate at home by any specification other than the circumstance that the souls to be saved are in non-Christian or non-Catholic lands. The specific purpose of missions does not seem to be different from the specific purpose of the apostolate of the Church everywhere. The places and the conditions are specifically different, of course. One might say therefore that the specific purpose of the apostolate in Japan, Korea or China is to save souls in Japan, Korea or China. The specific purpose of the apostolate in the U. S. or in any country of Europe is to save souls in the U. S. or in the designated European country.

There is a specific and important difference in the spiritual need of souls in mission lands as compared with souls in home countries. There is a specific and important difference in the ways and means of the apostolate in mission lands and those of the apostolate at home. In these respects—urgency and mode—rather than in primary purpose, might a specific distinction be found. In the missionary means—transplanting oneself to a foreign land and people, preaching to non-Christians, overcoming anti-Christian prejudice, adapting suitable native practices, even those of religious origin, forming a native clergy, laying the groundwork for a native hierarchy—there you have a specifically distinct method for achieving the primary apostolic purpose of saving souls.

I repeat that what I challenge is Fr. Charles' theory on the primary purpose of missions. I maintain that the primary purpose of the missions is the salvation of souls and that the missions are primarily a work of highest charity. I can only refer the reader to the *Review* for April, 1951, pp. 272-89, for my reasons. Fr. Murphy's interesting paper ranges over a fairly wide field, but as a reply does not seem to come to grips decisively with the reasons presented. He does remark (p. 173): "It is fair to say that some of Fr. Charles' popularizations may have given ground for criticism." I submit that this ground exists. I think that many missionaries would meet on it.

PATRICK O'CONNOR

St. Columban's
Seoul, Korea

QUEEN OF MERCY

Part II

From the notions of kingship in general and of Christ's Kingship in particular that were mentioned in Part I of this article, we can begin to examine the true nature of Mary's Queenship. "Rex et regina ab eadem denominatur dignitate et regno et principatu"—but as pseudo-Athansius has said "ut *femina* Regina et Domina . . . est." What then is the distinctive character and role of a *woman* as sovereign, i.e., as queen? Two exclusions are immediately necessary. We are not speaking of a queen who reigns in her own name because there is no male heir to the throne. Such a woman is the monarch, lacks nothing of kingship except the title. And secondly, we are not considering a queen-mother. Such a woman is queen before she is mother. That is, she is not a queen because her son is king, rather he is king because his parents were royal. So we must consider queenship in its *proper* nature, i.e., the state and role of the woman who reigns, not in place of a king but *beside* a king, his consort in his very royalty and sovereignty. What constitutes a woman in such estate? It is precisely her *unique association with the person who is king*. He has espoused her: he has taken her into his home, into his most personal life, he has made her the sharer of his goods, the companion of his life. Between them is a union of persons unique, indissoluble. Because the Queen has espoused the person who is *par excellence* royal, because she is in a very true sense one precisely with that royal personality she is thereby constituted in royalty. She is royal, not as the king is royal, but as a *woman* is royal, i.e., as the unique associate of the life of the king. She must be then uniquely associated in his royalty also.[1]

In no other form of government is it true that the spouse of the ruler, or chief of state, achieves *ipso facto* official personality.

[1] De facto, law or custom sometimes decrees that a king's legitimate consort can be queen only if her own blood be noble. In such cases nobility of blood is prerequisite to queenship as a subjective disposition. Even then the queen's own blood does not establish her as queen; formally only association with the king can do that.

Never in a republic, for example, is the "First Lady" a true sovereign. Not infrequently attempts on her part to achieve a *de facto* status as a public personality are deeply resented, and this is understandable. For in a republic power is not attached to the *person* who is chief of state, or ruler, but to an office. The head of a republic is not a sovereign person: his power is delegated from the sovereign people because sovereignty is not his personal possession or right. Those who are associated with his person do not attain to association in sovereignty. His office gives power: but the office is not a personal possession, and therefore is usually of relatively brief duration, and is never hereditary.

In any case, the proper and distinctive role of queen in any realm is (1) the role of a woman as such; (2) the role not of any woman but of that woman alone who is most intimately and indissolubly united to the king. Human kind is not man alone for "from the beginning God made them male and female." As the primal font of human life is not one alone but both, so with royalty; the source of the blood royal (that blood to which is attached the very royalty) is not the king alone but king and queen. Even in his kingship then the sovereign is, so to say, incomplete without the queen, for only in union with her does he exercise some, at least, of his functions for the common good, e.g., providing for the succession, a matter of great moment to the state, and a matter, too, which is truly an exercise of royal and not merely private prerogative.

Before considering what power is proper to a queen as such, it is well to see with what sublime perfection Mary has been constituted a queen. A queen is so constituted by reason of a unique union with the person of the King. The union between the Christ-King and Mary is a perfect and transcendant thing. At the moment of the Annunciation, the Most Holy Trinity, through Gabriel, manifested divine consent to union of the Word with Mary: and explicitly to His union with her in His royal character. "And the Angel said to her. . . . 'Behold thou shalt conceive in Thy womb and thou shalt bear a son. . . . The Lord God shall give to him the seat of David his father: and he shall reign in the house of Jacob forever, and of his kingdom there shall be no end.' " Mary was offered complete, perfect union with the Christ-King, a union with Him, note, in that *foundation* of his Kingship: the fact that He is the Divine Redeemer. For His name was to be

Deus *salus*—Jesus-God salvation. She was offered union specified by His character as Divine Redeemer, a union that should be total, a union that called for her to surrender utterly, completely, her destiny, that she be assumed into the everlasting destiny of the God-Saviour, the Christ-King. She was offered Divine Maternity; and with it indissoluble union with the Redeemer and King as such. "And Mary said 'Be it done unto me according to thy word.'" The universe sang out: the very Angels trembled in their ecstasy of sheerest joy that it was to be accomplished: and human history was achieved, human salvation begun.

An ordinary queen consents to union with the already existing person of the king. So did Mary; for she did not constitute the Person who is Christ, nor give Him existence (though she did co-operate in giving Him a new nature). An ordinary queen consents to a lifelong union with the king: Mary did more; she consented to an eternal union. An ordinary queen consents to this that: "They shall be two in one flesh," for this is written even of royal spouses. But the union between Christ and Mary is far grander: there in Mary's womb they are two in one flesh not in the sense of *a uniting* but of *oneness:* for Mary's is the *only* flesh and from it comes totally the flesh of the Christ-King; that life-giving flesh of which the Incarnation is but a beginning. Mary consented to a union which is total; the giving of every thought, every breath, every action so that henceforth she had, so to say, no life apart from her Christ-King.

Most clearly such consent as Mary gave must establish her as Queen. For Christ is King because He is in Person very God: and it was at His majestic Person that Mary's consent to utter union terminated. Mary pertains, and pertains substantially to the hypostatic order: and that order is essentially and intrinsically royal, kingly. By reaching—or rather by being raised—into that order Mary inevitably is robed in queenliness of unique character. And because she is united to Christ as Divine Redeemer her union looks necessarily—as a union of sovereigns should—to the common good. The very Incarnation is "propter nos homines et propter nostram salutem": so is Mary's royal character, which is a consequence of the Incarnation. Her whole life, her whole being, is orientated to the common good which is Christ. A Queen? In her title to royal dignity, in her sovereign dedication to the common good of the Communion of Saints she

far outstrips the connotations of that title. We should attempt not to prove that Mary is Queen, but that the title is able to express something of her glory! In her Divine Maternity, therefore, Mary puts on a perfect character as Queen: for she achieves a perfect union with that Person who is perfect King. "Natura humana ab extra *ad deitatis fines attingit* quasi uxor ab extra adveniens in thalamo uteri virginalis."[2] Mary has entered into an order essentially, intrinsically royal. She could not possibly escape Queenship.

Christ, by right, is King because He is in Person true God. But the Christ-King has as it were a second title to his Kingdom—that of conquest. He has earned, merited, His power over us by redeeming us in His Passion. Similarly Mary has, as it were, another title to her queenly estate, besides her fundamental one in the Incarnation "Non est vicaria sed coadjutrix et *socia particeps in regno quae fuit particeps passionum pro genere humano.*" So St. Albert succinctly words the argument.[3] Christ merited his authority over us by His sufferings and victory, the sufferings which were victory. With His Passion and victory the Virgin is most intimately associated. She was with Him on Calvary not merely by bodily presence but, more importantly, by union of mind and will and heart. And as Christ offered Himself to the Eternal Father a Victim for us all and thereby purchased us all as His own: somewhat similarly Mary offered Him too. Him whom she loved indescribably more than she loved her own life, she whole-heartedly willed to see slain for the common welfare of us all, unto the glory of God. She co-operated in His sacrificial offering.

This, of course, does not mean that Mary earned royal power over us just as Christ did. No, in her case, all depended on Christ; the value of all she did depended on her union with Him—the very graces whereby she acted as she did were merited for her by Christ on His Cross. But she was none the less a true co-operator in Christ's conquest: and she did in literal truth *merit* (though by congruous merit) thereby her Queenly status. The Man of Sorrows by sorrow earned Kingship. The Sorrowful Mother, through sorrow, earned Queenship. If a queen is the

[2] Cajetan, *Commentarium in Sum. theol.*, II-II, q. 103, a. 4, n. IV.
[3] *Mariale*, q. 46.

woman who is uniquely one with the person of the king even in his intimate life, how gloriously has the Virgin earned her Queenship in her utterly unique union with Christ in His most kingly moment, the moment of His death! Never was woman, or queen, so intimately associated with the foundation of the kingdom as was the Virgin in the Christ-King's conquest of His realm. And this like all else was ordered to the common good. Surely sovereign power is fittingly given for such sovereign devotion!

(*To be continued*)

THOMAS U. MULLANEY, O.P.

Dominican House of Studies
Washington, D. C.

GRATIA PLENA

The plenitude of grace possessed by the Blessed Virgin was very different from that of her Divine Son. From the first moment of His mortal life, the human soul of Jesus Christ, on account of its hypostatic union with the Word, was endowed with the highest degree of sanctifying grace that the ordinary power of God can bestow. For this reason, and also because from the beginning He possessed the Beatific Vision, our Divine Saviour was capable of no increase in sanctity. The progress referred to in Luke 2:52 was merely an external manifestation of spiritual growth. But the sanctifying grace of Mary was capable of increase, and she did, in fact, advance in supernatural perfection and beauty from the first rational act of her life until the last moment of her earthly exile.

—The Very Rev. Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R., in "Our Lady and the Sacraments," in *AER*, LXII, 5 (May, 1920), 533.

THE EQUIPMENT OF THE MARRIAGE COUNSELOR

Our Holy Father has told us: "One of the chief concerns of the Church today, beyond doubt must be to put a stop, by all means possible, to the decadence of marriage and the family." Certainly the best means of all is wider use of the sacramental grace of Christ received through Matrimony and continuing throughout married life. Proper premarital training for marriage is necessary. Solution of many economic and social problems of the nation is important for wholesome family life. A healthier attitude in our culture, represented largely by the press, radio, television and theatre, towards marriage and the family must be cultivated.

Our Holy Father has said that *all means,* however, must be used to rescue marriage and the family. My concern here is still another means for this purpose that is in a sense new and somewhat technical, called marriage counseling.[1] The Church for centuries has engaged in marriage education. The Church for centuries too has done marriage counseling. But the Church is always open to new and better techniques for doing her job, in marriage as well as in everything else. Hence Catholics are becoming interested today in the possibilities of doing a better job of counseling in marriage than has been done in the past, through use of experts trained in new techniques that are being developed. By a marriage counselor I therefore mean such an expert, and not any other person who, incidentally as a part of his other professional work, happens to counsel couples whose marriages are in danger. Certainly marriage counseling has been done throughout the ages, by priests and teachers, by doctors and lawyers, by friends of the family, and even by the in-laws. This is marriage counseling; and it may be very good, as indeed it often has been; but the person who does this sort of thing incidentally, is not called today a marriage counselor. In other words, a marriage counselor today is a professional person who, although he may have received his primary specialized training in another area, such as theology,

[1]Grateful acknowledgment for assistance in preparing this paper is made to Dr. Alphonse Clemens, who is in charge of the marriage counseling program at The Catholic University of America.

medicine, sociology, social work, or psychology, has also added to his professional equipment particular techniques appropriate to handling problems of maladjustment in marriage.

A question that arises quite frequently today is: "who should do marriage counseling in this professional, technical way?" Some priests maintain that only priests should do marriage counseling. Psychiatrists are to be found who assert that it is the psychiatrist who is particularly competent in marriage problems, as he is, we are given to believe, in every problem of personal adjustment. The economist may tell us that budgeting problems are at the root of most marital problems. Some physicians seem to think there is no problem in marriage that cannot be solved by a little instruction in anatomy. Many marriage counselors are trained in psychology: they may call themselves clinical psychologists or consulting psychologists. To them only the most severe problems of marital maladjustment need a psychiatrist: all other problems are to be handled by a psychologist. The sociologists probably have been most involved in marriage counseling, with the expected attitude that it is a sociologist who is best equipped to do this work.

In this connection I should like to refer to the experience of the Veterans Administration in attempting to provide adequate psychotherapy for the heavy load of neuropsychiatric cases following World War II. There was much debate as to who should do psychotherapy, with the psychiatrists, the clinical psychologists, and the psychiatric social workers as the principal antagonists. There was involved in the controversy much traditional professionalism of the psychiatrists, as well as lots of muscle flexing on the part of the newly arriving professions of clinical psychology and psychiatric social work. In general, the question was settled, not on the basis of which profession as such could make out the best case, but on the basis of the particular qualifications of the individual therapist. The principle was recognized that, although, in general, psychiatrists would be better equipped to do all kinds of therapy, nevertheless there were individual psychologists and psychiatric social workers who might be better qualified as therapists for particular patients than individual psychiatrists. The solution to the problem was really patient-centered instead of profession-centered: anyone was allowed, and is now allowed, to do

therapy who can help the patient. "Anyone may do any of the things for the patient's good who is properly prepared."[2]

I think the same solution might be applied to the question of who should do marriage counseling. The answer is, a person who is equipped to do marriage counseling. The Report of the Joint Subcommittee on Standards for Marriage Counselors of the National Council on Family Relations obviously takes this view that no one of the existing professions should have exclusive right in Marriage Counseling when it states that the appropriate graduate or professional degree for a marriage counselor shall be in one of the following fields: education, home economics, law, medicine, nursing, psychology, religion, social anthropology, social work and sociology.[3] That takes in about everybody who would want to get into the act.

The title of my paper is "The Equipment of the Marriage Counselor." My first point, just made, is a negative one: membership in no one of the traditional professions is to be set up as an essential condition for doing marriage counseling. Anyone can do it who is equipped. We shall now proceed to examine what that equipment should be.

It is worthwhile to examine the qualifications set up by the Subcommittee on Standards for Marriage Counselors of the National Council on Family Relations. The first qualifications given are academic. The Subcommittee states: "Every marriage counselor shall have a graduate or professional degree from an approved institution as a minimum qualification. This degree shall be in one of the following fields: education, home economics, law, medicine, nursing, psychology, religion, social anthropology, social work, and sociology." I certainly think some kind of advanced training with a degree beyond the bachelor's degree is essential for professional work as a marriage counselor. I do not see that it is wise at this time to require that the degree be in a specific field, as indicated above. I can think of two other graduate degrees, at least, that might be held by a marriage counselor: in philosophy,

[2] Daniel Blain, "The Psychiatrist and the Psychologist," *Journal of Clinical Psychology* (1947), III, 7.

[3] National Council on Family Relations. Report of the Joint Subcommittee on Standards for Marriage Counselors. *Marriage and Family Living* (Winter, 1949), XI, 5-6.

and in economics other than "home" economics. It is difficult to see how a degree as such in one of the enumerated fields qualifies one for work as a marriage counselor. And since the Subcommittee itself goes on to specify areas of specialized training, it seems more prudent not to require that the advanced degree be obtained in a specified field. Once again, what is important is the actual equipment of the counselor, not the field of his graduate specialty.

The Subcommittee states: "Whatever the field of major emphasis, there shall be included accredited training in: psychology of personality development; elements of psychiatry; human biology, including the fundamentals of sex anatomy, physiology and genetics; sociology of marriage and the family; legal aspects of marriage and the family; and counseling techniques." I think we can agree without question that all of these areas of training are important for marriage counseling. But as Catholics, we must add more: there must be training in the theology and canon law of marriage, since the marriage state is more than a human relationship; there must also be a proper philosophical concept of the nature of man and of human powers. Scientific training in the areas indicated above is important; but our Catholic synthesis is a philosophical and theological synthesis as well: hence, in addition to training in the modern areas of scientific specialization there must be that deeper knowledge of man as a personality that comes from philosophical and theological insights into reality. In addition to theological and philosophical training I would add that the blueprint given above by the Subcommittee omits something else, training in the purely economic aspects of marriage and family life. It is wrong to say that all marriage difficulties are economically caused; it is also wrong to omit from the training of a marriage counselor equipment to handle problems of budgeting and of meeting financial obligations that often are at the root of marriage difficulties. In the area of psychological training I do not think it is sufficient to list the psychology of personality development and techniques of counseling. As we shall see shortly, the counselor is called upon to make diagnostic judgments. For this purpose he should have some knowledge of modern psychological testing techniques.

The Subcommittee lists next the professional experience that is to be required of a marriage counselor: at least three years of recognized professional experience subsequent to obtaining his degree, and some actual experience as a clinical assistant in marriage counseling under approved supervision. These requirements are indeed the ideal for the certifying of marriage counselors, and I think should be regarded as a goal towards which we should work. If marriage counseling is to be accepted as a serious profession and not the playground of quacks, then serious requirements must be set up for practitioners. Certainly these requirements will not be strictly enforced at the beginning; if so, there just wouldn't be much marriage counseling done. But experience is really the best teacher here as in about everything else. Hence I think we would do well to set our sights high and aim at the training of counselors who have not only book learning and fancy degrees, but the know-how that is acquired through actual work in a professional setting. This idea has long been accepted in medicine, where an internship is required, and in social work, where supervised experience is required. The latest profession to require such supervised training is clinical psychology, in which a full year's internship is required as essential to a doctorate program, and in which additional years of experience are required before full diplomate status as a clinical psychologist is given.

The Subcommittee continues: "A candidate's qualifications shall include diagnostic skill in differentiating between the superficial and the deeper levels of maladjustment, and the ability to recognize when the latter type requires referral to other specialists." That is really a large order. For such skill much more than a course or two in personality theory and the elements of psychiatry is needed. Real professional skill in making such diagnoses is hard to find even in experienced clinical psychologists, and if the problem requires differential diagnosis between psychological and physical maladjustments, then the professional training of the physician is required. To demand all of this of the marriage counselor is to demand the impossible. It is true that the marriage counselor can, through his graduate training and his experience, become sensitized to the recognition of the more serious forms of personality maladjustment; but it does not seem likely that he will be much of a diagnostician unless he is highly trained as a

clinical psychologist or as a psychiatrist. I recall one little controversy between a sociologist and a psychiatrist, both interested in marriage counseling. The sociologist stated that in his experience relatively few marriage maladjustments had psychological or psychiatric problems as their cause. The psychiatrist replied that the sociologist could say that because he was unable to recognize psychological or psychiatric problems when he saw them. The sociologist retorted that psychiatrists see personality disorders everywhere, and refuse to recognize other causes of marriage difficulties. So there we are! Most marriage counselors would not possess sufficient diagnostic skill unless long and detailed training were added to what has already been suggested. And, moreover, training in diagnostic skills *alone* will make the counselor so sensitive to psychological maladjustments that he may exaggerate their importance.

The Subcommittee is a bit over-excited about the importance of a scientific attitude in marriage counseling. It states that one of the qualifications of a marriage counselor must be "A scientific attitude toward individual variation and deviation, especially in the field of human sex behavior, and the ability to discuss sexual problems objectively." All this is of course obvious. The marriage counselor should be able to discuss all questions objectively, and not become emotionally involved himself in the problems of those he is trying to help. The counselor, too, should have a scientific attitude towards variation and deviation, as well as towards everything else. By scientific attitude here seems to be meant that the counselor will not let his own biases and prejudices determine his handling of a case, but will handle it against the background of all the facts obtainable. All this seems obvious in counseling as well as elsewhere.

Last to be listed by the Subcommittee are the personal qualifications for the marriage counselor. They are: "a. The candidate shall possess personal and professional integrity in accordance with accepted ethical standards. b. The candidate shall have an attitude of interest, warmth, and kindness toward people, combined with a high degree of integration and emotional maturity. c. The personal experience of marriage and parenthood is a decided asset." I don't think we can disagree with any of these recommendations. There might be added, however, certain precisions and developments of the points given above.

Whether the counselor goes all out for the client-centered, non-directive techniques, or attempts to use other techniques as well in his counseling, he must remember that the basic aim of all counseling must not be "doing something for the married couple," but "helping them to help themselves." Hence the authoritarian, didactic, domineering approach we find too often everywhere is impossible for good marriage counseling. Even on ethical and religious matters, the aim of the counselor should not be coercion, but clarification. In addition, the counselor must have considerable flexibility in his techniques. Rigidity is not a virtue in a counselor. All perfectionist attitudes such as "my way is the only way" ruin the counseling relationship. Respect for the dignity of the persons being counseled carries along with it a very deep humility with regard to one's own involvement in the counseling situation. Above all for the Catholic counselor, there must be a deep appreciation of the sacramental character of the marriage relationship. The counselor must approach his task equipped not only with the scientific techniques of modern counseling but with the spirit of Christ and with the grace of Christ. The successful Catholic counselor will continue his work for his clients by praying for them: he must consider himself one of the ministers of God's grace, and must recognize that what he does is like the watering of Apollo: it is God who will give the increase.

It is interesting that the Subcommittee of The National Council on Family Relations states that marriage and parenthood is a "decided asset" rather than an essential prerequisite for marriage counseling. I know nothing of the deliberations of the Subcommittee; but it does not seem fantastic to suppose that one of the reasons for this guarded wording is that the Subcommittee did not want to imply that the Catholic clergy, or other unmarried persons, were for that reason incapable of doing marriage counseling. I think we must admit, however, that marriage and parenthood *are* decided assets in marriage counseling. In a plan I shall propose shortly it will be seen how the skills of the clergyman can be combined with the additional insights of the laity who have had themselves the experience of marriage and parenthood. In this connection it is of extreme interest to note that The National Marriage Guidance Council of Great Britain has also declared that marriage and parenthood are assets to marriage counseling,

but has made the added precision that the married counselor should have been *happily* married, and that divorced persons should be *ipso facto* disqualified as marriage counselors.[4]

I am going to propose two plans for marriage counseling, both of which involve what might be called the "team" approach to the problem. One plan might be called the "co-operative plan" and the other the "clinical plan." The co-operative approach is the more feasible because it involves less expense and fewer professional personnel. I think the clinic approach, where the facilities are available, is really the better approach and should be the long-term goal towards which we should aim.

For Catholics, the co-operative approach should always involve the services of the parish clergy. It may be the priest himself who has received graduate training in the techniques of marriage counseling. But he would not be expected to have all the detailed equipment required for marriage counseling possessed by a variety of professions, sociology, medicine, psychology, law, etc. The co-operative plan is this: the priest, or whoever else might see the married couple for initial counseling, should have available the expert services of other professional people. He should know a good physician or two in the community, several lawyers, and a psychiatrist, sociologist, psychologist, if they exist. He should establish a co-operative relationship with these other professions for two purposes: he should consult these professional people routinely on the problems he is meeting that may be areas of their own professional competence; and he should establish a plan of referral so that the physician, lawyer, psychologist, etc., can be called in on those cases in which they may have something to contribute. Note that I have suggested two kinds of professional relationship, that of consultation and of referral. Whoever it may be who acts as the primary agent in marriage counseling, whether he is priest, sociologist or teacher, it will be indeed rare that he possesses enough diagnostic skill to be able to detect in many cases whether or not additional referrals are necessary. Hence the need for almost continual consultation with the other professions. It is an error to believe that any marriage counselor, no matter what his own professional attachments, is sufficiently sensitive to difficulties in all

[4] *Family Life*, X, 2 (Feb. 1950), 4.

areas to be able to make a complete diagnosis on the basis of his own training and experience.

In addition to facilities for consultation, there must be a system of routine referral to the specialties concerned. I don't think a plan such as this is impracticable except in the very smallest communities, and with our present speed of transportation and communication, it should really not be impracticable anywhere except on a desert island. For there will be available at least some professional persons to whom referral can be made for at least some problems. To set up a rigid system of referral may, indeed, be impracticable. Thus, to say that a psychiatrist must always be available for such a plan to work, is not much help, since there are whole states without a single fully qualified psychiatrist. Even scarcer are properly trained sociologists and clinical psychologists.

The above presentation of the "co-operative plan" has been made on the basis of a priest as the initial contact for marriage counseling. The same plan, however, could be worked out with members of other professions as the initial contact. Thus, in addition to the priest having arrangements with a physician for consultation and referral of cases that come to the priest, there may also be arrangements whereby the physician will consult with the priest and refer to him those cases in which religious or moral assistance is required.

The second plan suggested is called the "clinical plan." It seems most feasible to have it organized at present in a Catholic university or college or in connection with the agencies of Catholic Charities. There are several ways in which the marriage counseling clinic may be organized. It is not necessary, in my opinion, that a member of any particular profession should be the director. The director might be a psychiatrist, a sociologist, a psychologist, a social worker, or an expert in marriage counseling who may have received a graduate degree in any of the specialties mentioned earlier. The essential idea of the clinic approach is multi-discipline co-operation. Cases would be referred for counseling from the parish clergy, from physicians, from social agencies or from many other sources. Many couples would come of their own accord. Each case, after an initial interview, would be "staffed" at a meeting of all the professional groups represented in the clinic. It would be decided in staff what diagnostic investigation is necessary in order to do effective counseling. Typical diagnostic

procedures might be psychological testing to determine level of intelligence and possible presence of personality maladjustments. A psychiatric examination would seem generally feasible also for this latter purpose. Complete sociological and economic data should be available through social service or other means. Perhaps medical examinations would be indicated. After the collecting of the necessary information, the case would be staffed again, this time to determine the therapeutic measures to be used. Perhaps the services of the staff lawyer or economist may be needed; perhaps the basic difficulty is one of lack of proper religious instruction; perhaps there is needed a fairly long term of psychiatric counseling for husband or wife or both. Indicated therapy would then be determined and begun. The case should come up in staff again when it is to be closed.

This all seems over-elaborate, and subject to two very serious criticisms: (1) it is almost impossible to have all the professional people desired represented on the staff; (2) many cases do not need such elaborate handling. In reply to the first objection it might be stated that all the professional people mentioned need not be full members of the staff; they can be attached to the staff in a consultant capacity. There should be considerable flexibility here. For example, if there is a well-organized clinic in the community for personality problems, like the Adult Guidance Clinic of the Brooklyn Charities, or the Child Center of The Catholic University of America, perhaps the marriage counseling clinic might be set up less along psychological and psychiatric lines and more along social and economic. A system of consultant participation could be arranged with the psychological and psychiatric clinics so that these specialists could be available for some service in the marriage counseling clinic. On the other hand, if the clinic is organized along psychiatric lines, then other specialties such as sociology, economics, law and nursing might be represented through consultants. I see no reason why a clinic with four or five full-time professional members (plus secretarial services) should not be able to function adequately with the assistance of consultants from other disciplines.

The second objection, that such an elaborate service is not needed in a large number of cases, requires two comments. The first comment is that one of the difficulties with marriage counseling

today is the attitude that too many problems can be solved with a ten-minute pep talk by an eager marriage counselor. All of us have helped people, and perhaps have helped them much and permanently, with a kind word or two when trouble came. This of course should be done always. But this is hardly marriage counseling in the modern technical sense. It is simply practicing charity, which marriage counseling or nothing else should ever supplant. But the danger is often this: we think that the smile on the face of the person we have helped in this way means that all his problems have been solved. It only means he is grateful for the crumb we have given. He may be in need of far more substantial nourishment that can come only through expert and perhaps elaborate counseling. It is easy to give answers to people's difficulties and it is easy to give comforting advice. It is hard to reconstruct shattered marriages and rebuild broken lives. However, it must be admitted that some cases do need only surface counseling, as it were, and do not require anything more than a short counseling interview. This sort of case can also be handled by the clinic plan. We are experimenting at The Catholic University of America with such a service for students, called student psychiatric counseling. Our psychiatrists are available one hour a week for consultation with students on personal problems; referrals are from the Deans of Men and Women, the campus physician, and the Director of the University Counseling Center. Elaborate therapy cannot be undertaken. Assistance can be given to some in the brief interview available. Those who need more assistance can be detected, and proper measures taken. In the same way in a marriage counseling clinic the easy cases can be handled the easy way. But there will be less danger of calling too many cases easy and of thinking that anyone with lots of zeal and a little advice can always change a life.

The Catholic Church for centuries has been the leader in bringing assistance to men and women in trouble. The divine mission of grace has overflowed into a human mission of help to the unfortunate. We have hospitals and schools, orphanages and homes for the aged, missions at home and abroad. We have developed many excellent programs of training on the doctorate level for sociology, medicine, law, psychology and about everything else, except marriage counseling. We have Child Guidance Clinics

and Adult Guidance Clinics, although certainly not enough. But we have no system of marriage counseling services at all. Marriage counseling is done, of course, and with God's help will continue to be done, by countless zealous workers in the vineyard of the Lord. But Our Holy Father says we must use *all* means to put a stop to the decadence of marriage and the family. I think a means that must be used is an adequate program of marriage counseling, that makes use of all that is best in modern scientific techniques, that draws its inspiration from our philosophical heritage, and that is based firmly on the Rock that is Christ.

JOHN W. STAFFORD, C.S.V.

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

INSTRUCTION IN HOLINESS

It would be a great mistake to suppose that a pastor has to teach his people only their essential duties. It is the whole divine message that he is bound to deliver to them, "teaching them to observe *all things whatsoever* I have commanded you" (Mat. xxvii), the Beatitudes as well as the Decalogue, the various methods of devotion and practices of love, as well as the humblest and most elementary forms of moral obligations. True, it is neither necessary nor expedient that the teachings of the pastor should go beyond the practical aptitude and possibilities of his hearers. But although the latter may be very limited in most, they are by no means so in all. Indeed the pastor may take it for granted that among the number of those committed to his care, there are always some, often many, susceptible of a higher degree of spiritual culture and capable, if only properly taught, of practising in no ordinary degree the Christian virtues.

—Fr. John Hogan, S.S., in the 21st of his articles on *Clerical Studies*, *AER*, X, 6 (June, 1894), 404.

A QUEST OF THOUGHTS

Part VII

ATHEISM AND ANARCHISM

Some men see that it is wrong for the State to do certain of the things that are done. They then conclude that the State itself is evil, that it should be destroyed, and that with its destruction men will again be free and good and happy. These are anarchists.

Other men hold that crimes and wrongs are committed in the name of religion. Then they conclude that religion itself is wrong and should be destroyed. When they arrive at the ultimate conclusion that God does not exist and that all prayer and worship are evil, they are atheists. The atheist is the anarchist in religion, but men do not see that the anarchist who would destroy the Church is even worse and more dangerous than the anarchist who would destroy the State.

Why more dangerous? Because men cannot live without some sort of civil government, whereas they can live without the Church. They live, but in sin and error and in darkness and danger. Anarchy is insanity that cannot be hidden away or denied. Atheism is insanity unrecognized. It is the madman's belief that he alone is sane. Like every mental disorder it must show its real character and it has already done this by the violence that reigns throughout the world.

ESCAPISM

Tolstoy is one of the most profound and most searching of psychologists in literature. Few, if any, novelists equal his insight and his power of analysis. Thus in *War and Peace* he writes: "Sometimes Pierre remembered what he had been told of soldiers under fire in ambuscade when they have nothing to do, how they try hard to find occupation so as to bear their danger more easily. And Pierre pictured all men as such soldiers trying to find a refuge from life: some in ambition, some in cards, some in framing laws, some in women, some in playthings, some in horses, some in politics, some in sport, some in wine, some in the government service. 'Nothing is trivial, nothing is important,

everything is the same; only to escape from it as best one can', thought Pierre. 'Only not see *it*, that terrible *it*.' "

This reminds me somehow of Pascal's figure: The human race is like a group of men condemned to death. Each day one of the group is strangled.

Tolstoy's (or Pierre's) picture is more just, because it holds for men like Pierre, dissipated, wretched, vaguely hopeful for some change in themselves, without aim and purpose in life. Today the figure holds for hundreds of thousands and it will continue to apply to thousands more. Escapism, whether in collecting stamps, in communism, in dissipation, or in suicide, cannot but increase among men and women without faith, hope, and charity.

Life to the modern man will cease to be "challenging," to use a still popular word, and will become increasingly fearsome. This fear of life has long been manifest and its effects are seen. Birth control is but one of them.

ACTION AND REACTION

Protestantism began with a rejection of the saints. Veneration of Our Lady was called Mariolatry. Her statues were torn down, her shrines defiled, her life and character traduced. Veneration of the saints was forbidden as idolatry.

Later came the denial of the divinity of Christ, the assertion that He is not the Son of God in the clear and unequivocal sense taught by the Church of Rome.

What is Christ in the Protestant view? A profound psychologist, a great teacher, a wonderfully good and understanding man, a martyr, in a word, a saint.

Those Protestant leaders who have a personal devotion to Jesus Christ must venerate Him as a great saint. How do they pray to Him, if they do pray to Him? Do they ask Him to intercede for us with God, as Catholics say, "Hail, . . . pray for us sinners, now, and at the hour of our death?"

Protestantism, as in so many other ways, starts out by denying and rejecting the doctrine of the communion of the saints and ends by bringing it back in a mutilated and even blasphemous form.

REJECTION AND DESTRUCTION

If a system is made up of propositions that imply one another, no single proposition can be rejected without rejecting the whole system. Someone may think to pick and choose, and to reject one truth and keep the rest, but inevitably the whole system will be denied. The complete denial and rejection may take time in coming, but it will come. The individual may not see the final logic of his choice, but in the course of years and centuries logic has its way.

Thus it is with the teachings of the Catholic Church. The Church is perfectly consistent when it excommunicates the man who denies a single basic doctrine. In effect, it says, "If you hold that one of my teachings is false, you hold that all of them are false." If the answer is made, "No, I do not hold that every Catholic doctrine is false, but only this one or that one," the Church can point to what is the heretics' inevitable attitude towards her. The heretic attacks the Church as evil. He does not stop at denying one doctrine. He prefers to see men anything or nothing in religion rather than Catholic. He consorts with those who deny far more of Catholic teaching than he himself does and he supports them when they continue their destructive work. Better than he himself can know, or perhaps better than he will admit, he has done what the Church clearly sees and plainly states. In rejecting one Christian truth he has rejected all of them.

It is interesting to watch this progressive rejection as it has gone on in four centuries of Protestantism. A particular doctrine may be taken, such as that of a future life. It is the teaching of the Church that when a man dies he is judged. If he dies in the state of mortal sin and as an enemy of God, he is condemned to hell for all eternity. If he dies in the state of grace, he is judged worthy of heaven, there to enjoy everlasting happiness in the presence of God. If he still owes a debt of punishment for sins committed and forgiven but not yet fully requited by works of penance, the soul must remain an allotted time in purgatory until all the debt has been paid.

It was the doctrine of purgatory to which the reformers objected. There is no middle state, they said, in which holy souls suffer until their debt is paid. When a man dies, he goes forth-

with to heaven or to hell. Some held that a man's fate is sealed before death, and even before birth, but all were agreed in rejecting the Catholic doctrine of purgatory.

Yet the process of denial and rejection could not stop there. It was not long before individual men and then whole sects began to question the doctrine of hell. Could an infinitely good and merciful God condemn anyone to everlasting punishment? The thought of hell became too hard to bear and the reality of hell was first ignored and then denied. How many Protestant sects today are willing to define anything, much less the doctrine of eternal damnation? More important, among the vast mass of non-Catholics this doctrine has simply disappeared from their belief and consciousness.

Purgatory and hell have gone and heaven is going. Perhaps generally among members of the non-Catholic sects there is a belief in a heaven of some sort. However, there are sectarian leaders who refuse to admit that there is a heaven any more than that there is a purgatory or hell. Again more important, a vast share of the general non-Catholic group have come to think of this life as the only life and to have no hope or wish for any future existence. Purgatory and hell having been put out, heaven is now being rejected in speculation and even more so in practice.

The Catholic Church teaches that it is the one Church founded by Jesus Christ, that Jesus Christ is God, and that the Pope in Rome is the Vicar of Christ. How has the process of rejection treated these propositions? In the sixteenth century the first rejection was that of the authority of the Pope. Far from admitting that the Bishop of Rome is the Vicar of Christ, the reformers claimed that he is anti-Christ. Next there was the rejection of the Catholic Church as the church founded by Jesus Christ. It was held that there is no one true church universal, even that Christ never founded a church at all.

But Christ Himself? The rejection of His divinity was the next step. It has been denied that He is God. Or if it is said that He is divine, it is with weasel words, or with such vagueness that the assertion is meaningless, or with the explanation that Christ is divine with "the divinity that is in us all." In any case,

the tendency is all towards denying divinity to Jesus Christ in the traditional sense and in any literal and unequivocal way.

Nor is the full process of negation and rejection at an end. There have been Protestant clerics who have formally professed atheism. There are others who hold to a sort of pantheism. There are others whose ideas of God have become so confused and nebulous as to be unworthy of the name of ideas. Worst of all, millions of men and women who are Protestant in name or by descent have been so deprived of religious instruction that God has become little more than a name to them.

This then is the inevitable movement of rejection and destruction for those who follow the inner logic of Protestantism. First, the Vicar of Christ is rejected; then His Church; then Christ Himself; finally God and religion are lost and denied.

"A MURDEROUS EARTH"

Macbeth's words, "Tomorrow, and tomorrow, and tomorrow" and the rest are often quoted with approval as a judgment on life. It is agreed with Macbeth that life is but a brief candle, a walking shadow, a poor player, a tale told by an idiot, full of sound and fury, signifying nothing.

The pessimism and the nihilism in this judgment on life are approved, but it is forgotten that it is the judgment of one who was a traitor, a thief, and a murderer, and who was cruel, lustful, and destructive. For a man like Macbeth, who has made all the wrong decisions and who has done all the worst deeds, such despair is inevitable. Should we look for the wisdom of life in such a man?

If Hitler had Macbeth's eloquence and had left a record of his last thoughts as death drew near in the chancery in Berlin, what would he have said? If he passed a judgment consistent with his ambitions and deeds and their outcome, he would have spoken like Macbeth. Would that have made Hitler right in death, anymore than in life?

A man sets his heart on ends that have never yet brought satisfaction and uses means that have never brought success. He thinks to find substance in shadows and permanence in things that cannot remain. His only faith is in force. He is the fool who says in his heart, "There is no God." Shall we then look for wis-

dom in his final words? Only if those last words are an admission that he was wrong in his judgment on life and in the means that he took to subdue it, and not an affirmation of all that brought him to disaster.

The only genuine wisdom that can come from a Macbeth or a Hitler is an act of contrition, a disavowal of their crimes, and a recognition that it is justice and love that make life something other than they had thought it to be.

GENIUS AND TALENT

There are authors who turn out a great volume of work, all of which is bad or indifferent except for one single memorable production. There are others who are consistently good. There are some great geniuses who rarely fail.

There are still others whose record includes things that are very bad when compared with the masterpieces that they have written. The same thing holds true of composers, of sculptors, and of composers.

Thus in Newman's case, we find that his prose writings are uniformly upon the very highest level. As a poet he cannot rank so high. Yet there are vast differences in his volume of verse. He produced one poetic masterpiece, *The Dream of Gerontius*, some fine sonnets, such as *The Progress of Unbelief*, a beautiful hymn, *The Pillar of the Cloud*, and certain other poems of value. Along with them, he wrote, and preserved, a number of verses that abound in outmoded tricks of rhetoric and poetic diction and that are cold and lifeless or even trivial.

Charles Lamb is another case in point. Along with his letters and essays, he wrote *Rosamund Gray* and his three plays. As a poet he is remembered chiefly for *The Old Familiar Faces*. The bulk of his poetry is graceful and tender; some of it humorous, some of it religious; all of it is sincere. Though he rarely rises to a height of thought or feeling, Lamb wrote a few poems worthy of being remembered and of being better known than they are. Among them are the sonnets "O, I could long to hear the midnight wind," "Work," and "Written at Cambridge."

CHARITY THE GREATEST

"Now there remain faith, hope, and charity, these three, and the greatest of these is charity."

Often it is thought that charity is the greatest of the three theological virtues in the sense that doing works of charity is more important than believing in God and hoping in Him. This is a variation of the doctrine that religion is simply a social and humanitarian affair and that creeds and dogmas do not matter or even that they are false and bad. There is no more erroneous view of charity than this, and nothing can be farther from St. Paul's thought on faith and hope as well as on charity. Without faith and hope, or in other words, without the true creed of the apostles, there can be no genuine love of God for His own sake and of our fellow men for God's sake.

One meets also in these false interpretations the familiar human error of illogical obversion. Because the Church praises virginity, it is thought to condemn marriage. Because St. Paul says that charity is the greatest, it is thought that somehow faith and hope are minimized. Yet the simple logic is that charity could not be greatest unless they were great. All three are great and all three are necessary for salvation. "He that believeth . . . shall be saved. . . . We are saved by hope." "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God . . . and thy neighbor as thyself." "God is love."

It is in this last truth that is found the final reason for what St. Paul says. By faith we know God and what He teaches. By hope we desire to see Him face to face. By the virtue of charity we strive to love God with all our heart, and all our mind, and all our strength, and for His sake, our neighbor as ourselves. By charity we become like God and united to God, who is love itself.

PASCAL

Pascal was a man of immense genius and also a man tortured in body and in mind. If his genius was great, his pride was likewise great. The secret of his life may be that in the very end he overcame the huge temptation to succumb to pride and to rebel against the Church.

I believe that Pascal was tempted to formal heresy and apostacy, and a document that he wrote near the end of his life indicates that for a time he succumbed. But it was his triumph, or better the triumph of grace in him, to rise above the temptation and the sin. It is only the Catholic who can understand this. The non-Catholic is perplexed that Pascal did not give way

completely and finally in his defiance of the Church's authority. How much greater would Pascal's name be in the modern world —great as it always has been— if he had defied the Church and broken away from it? What happened instead was a genuine and complete conversion in which Pascal escaped from a danger greater than those that beset grosser men.

GOD AND MAN

"'It is hard'," he said, "'to believe in God; but it is harder not to believe. I believe in God, not from what I see in Nature, but from what I find in man.'" Thus Tennyson in his eightieth year, as reported in his son's life of the poet.

Tennyson lived amid the glories of the Victorian age and could have said of them, *Quorum pars magna fui.* His theodicy, by his own statements, was pantheistic or tended towards pantheism. His beliefs and opinions were necessarily affected by the Darwinism, the scientism, the materialism, and the optimism of his time. The prevailing science of his day had taken away mystery, and signs of reason as well, from nature. But man's deeds were such that perfectibility, even if not perfection, was seen in him.

Yet Tennyson himself foresaw disaster for the modern world. If he had lived to see what we have seen since 1914, would he still have believed in God because of what he found in man? It is hoped that he would have continued to believe. Our temptation today is to lose faith in God because of what man has done. We look at the deeds done in the twentieth century and see nothing in history of so huge a malice. We contrast the human race with the brutes, and not to our own credit. We see greed, hate, cruelty, lust, murder, and falsity everywhere rampant, and we are tempted to turn still further away from God and to lose Him altogether in the night that men and Satan have brought upon the world.

THE TRUTHFUL MAN

Tennyson urged his son to be truthful, for a truthful man, he said, generally will have all the virtues.

He is right, of course. To be determined to abide by the truth means courage and integrity. A really truthful man cannot be a thief, a hypocrite, a wastrel, an adulterer, an apostate, or a traitor. His devotion to the truth will make him truthful to him-

self as well as to others. To know ourselves and to be ourselves is what we need above all else.

WAR AND PEACE

It has been said that war is too important a matter to be left in the hands of generals. It may be added that peace as well as war is too important to be left in the hands of statesmen. In all history has there ever been an age when secular rulers were so powerful and made such devastation? Yet the solution is still left in the hands of the statesmen. They will follow the same methods as in the past, will have the same faith in force, and will act upon the same principles of expediency. The result is that there are more and greater troubles in store for mankind.

THE PARTICULAR

"For particulars, as everyone knows, make for virtue and happiness; generalities are necessary evils. Not philosophers, but fret-sawyers and stamp-collectors compose the backbone of society" (Aldous Huxley: *Brave New World*, p. 2).

"Sixty-two thousand four hundred repetitions make one truth" (*ibid.*, p. 54).

Here are two of the basic principles upon which a totalitarian society is conducted. It must do away with philosophers and priests, and it must repeat its lies until they are accepted as truth. If it fails in either task, it will eventually collapse. And it will eventually collapse, wherever it is instituted, because priests and philosophers will appear and because truth will make itself known even though it is denied many more than 64,200 times.

SEARCHING AND FINDING

Voicing a modern attitude, Lessing said in effect, if not in so many words, that "the pursuit of truth is better than its attainment."

Contrast this with what St. Paul wrote of false teachers of religion: "They count among their number the men that will make their way into house after house, captivating weak women whose consciences are burdened by sin; women swayed by shifting passions, who are for ever inquiring—yet never attain to recognition of the truth."

THE ATOMIC BOMB

It was announced that an atomic bomb has been dropped upon Hiroshima, a city of 350,000, doing incalculable damage.

Such a weapon as the romancers have dreamed and written about has been devised and let loose.

In all the accounts in the papers there is almost no suggestion of a moral problem in the use of this bomb. But underneath, in people's hearts, there must be fear of sin as well as of death, when they think of the use of such a weapon.

When asked by the NCWC news service for a statement I gave them this:

"The story of the atomic bomb should fill us with dismay.

"The question arises: Does the malice of Japan's military leaders justify so ruthless an attack upon the Japanese people?

"With such a weapon there is no possibility of a distinction between helpless noncombatants and military objectives.

"Here is obliteration bombing with a vengeance and upon the largest scale. If we put this force to the uses of war, we must reflect upon what is in store for America and the world.

"Some day we too must endure such assaults.

"We have in this new weapon an added reason to see modern war in its true character and to end it forever." (Aug. 7, 1945)

JOHN K. RYAN

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

PHILOSOPHICAL IMPLICATIONS OF *HUMANI GENERIS*

PART II

THE VALUE OF REASON

Humani generis emphasizes repeatedly the value of human reason, which "... by its own natural force and light can arrive at a true and certain knowledge of the one personal God, who by His providence watches over and governs the world. . . ."[1] Fr. Hayen believes that this confidence in reason is one of the two central issues of the entire encyclical.[2] Again, we must admit that this is not novel doctrine, as the Vatican Council, the Anti-Modernist Oath, and the *Pascendi* maintained the same position, although none of them specified, as the *Humani generis* does, reason's ability to ascertain the existence of the natural law.[3]

The verbal formulation of the Anti-Modernist Oath, generally similar to the terminology of the Council, was particularly directed at the positivists, traditionalists, fideists, and neo-Kantians. Weigel cites the opinion of Felix Mamberg, S.J., that the *Humani generis* simply renews the condemnation of the fideists and traditionalists originally made by the Vatican Council.[4] At first this strikes one as an exaggerated claim, but actually, the fideistic mentality, though not articulate in the idiom of a specific school, is by no means extinct.

Historically, the attempt on the part of Catholics to find God without accepting the validity of a reasoned approach is a periodic occurrence, not only as a reaction against an irreligious rationalism (as in the case of De Bonald and Lamennais), but also because of what might be called an exaggerated awareness of the discontinuity between the human and the divine.

[1] *Humani generis*, 2; cf. also 4, 8, 16, 25, 29, and 32.

[2] Hayen, *op. cit.*, p. 114. Submission to the Magisterium is the second issue he mentions.

[3] *Humani generis*, 1, 29.

[4] Weigel, *op. cit.*, p. 534.

Most of the commentaries do not emphasize the significant fact that the Holy Father not only reaffirms the validity of reason, but also is careful not to overstate its claims. He mentions that the human intellect is hampered "both by the activity of the senses and the imagination, and by evil passions arising from original sin."[5] He is aware, moreover, that "a certain amount of truth is contained" in some of the errors to which he adverts.[6] The germ of truth in the fideistic approach is divine transcendence, a fact which the Holy Father takes into consideration when he stresses the need of divine Revelation as "morally necessary so that those religious and moral truths which are not of their nature beyond reason in the present condition of the human race, may be known by all men readily and with a firm certainty, and with freedom from error."[7]

The thought of the Holy Father here parallels the thought of the Angelic Doctor himself who writes in a famous passage in the *Summa Theologica*: "Even as regards those truths about God which human reason can investigate, it was necessary that man be taught by a divine revelation."[8]

Again, the encyclical gives evidence of the realization of the limited number of people to whom a perfectly valid rational approach would appeal but little.[9] The Holy Father's observations on this subject suggest Thomas' opinion that the three disadvantages arising from a lack of time, talent, and inclination make it necessary for truth concerning divine things to be presented to men with fixed certainty by way of faith and divine Revelation.[10]

It is significant that *Humani generis* summarily rejects the unwarranted accusation that the perennial philosophy is a rigorously sterile intellectualism that neglects the role of the will and the emotions in human life.[11] The fact that the rational appetite can and does assist reason in the acquisition of a more firm and certain knowledge of moral truth does not, however, justify the

[5] *Humani generis*, 2.
[6] *Ibid.*, 9.
[7] *Ibid.* 3; cf. also Conc. Vatic., Const. *De Fide Cath.*, cap. 2, *De Revelatione* (*DB*, 1876).
[8] I, q. 1, a. 1. Cf. also *Contra Gentiles*, I, 4; III, 47; IV, 1.
[9] *Humani generis*, 3, 4, 29.
[10] *Contra Gentiles*, Bk. I, ch. 4.
[11] *Humani generis*, 33.

confusion of the appetitive and cognitive faculties. In such a confusion religious convictions represent an arbitrary adoption of opinion motivated by will, rather than an inevitable logical conclusion discerned by the intellect.

A more fundamental assault on reason with which the encyclical is concerned is the contemporary tendency to deny reason's capacity at arriving at any absolute value or fundamental principles like those of sufficient reason, causality, contradiction, and identity.[12] Garrigou-Lagrange feels that the chief significance of the *Humani generis* is to be found in its condemnation of a relativism inevitably consequent upon a denial of metaphysical absolutes.[13] He separates his discussion of the problem into a critique of both theological and philosophical relativism. The latter he maintains, stems from three main currents of thought; empiricism, Kantianism, and Hegelian idealism. The first recognizes no essential difference of intellectual and sensitive levels of knowledge, and minimizes considerably the value of primary notions of being, unity, truth, goodness, substance, and cause. Kantianism, despite its rejection of the empirical disdain for first principles, conceives those principles as subjective law incapable of application outside the realm of phenomena. Even Kant's God is a mere postulate of practical reason, not a being whose existence is discovered by the pure or "thinking" reason. Truth becomes "ambulatory," to use James' phrase, inasmuch as it involves, not an adequation of the intellect and the thing, but a conformity of judgment to subjective moral dispositions. As Jaspers, who considered a study of Kant and Plato adequate for philosophical essentials, was to say later in his *Existenzphilosophie*: "Since Kant, all ontology is condemened."

The third source of philosophical relativism cited by Garrigou-Lagrange is Hegelian anti-rationalism, by which an ascendent process of evolution in a kind of metaphysical *anatrope* produces the more perfect from the less perfect in triadic regularity.[14]

[12] *Humani generis*, 29.

[13] Reginald Garrigou-Lagrange, O.P., "L'encyclique 'Humani Generis' et la doctrine de Saint Thomas," *Revista di filosofia neo-scolastica*, 43 (Jan.–Feb., 1951), 43. Cf. also the same author's "La structure de l'encyclique 'Humani Generis,' " *Angelicum*, 28 (Jan.–March, 1951), 3.

[14] Hegel's evolutionary conception of reality implies a similarly evolutionary conception of truth.

The transcendent God is not in this Hegelian approach an immutable truth for the simple reason that in such a system there are no metaphysical absolutes.

OTHER PHILOSOPHICAL ERRORS

The philosophical errors to which the Holy Father adverts may be divided roughly into two categories: those dangerous tendencies manifested by Catholic thinkers out of misguided zeal and false progressivism; and those, like dialectical materialism, scepticism, idealism, existentialism, and historicism, which are largely localized in non-Scholastic circles. For the encyclical is more than an "affectueuse mise-en-garde"; it is also a vehicle of condemnation.[15]

On the other hand it would be quite misleading, however convenient, to maintain that the Holy Father is merely reassembling battle lines against old ideological enemies previously denounced. He speaks, for instance, of errors which ". . . have crept in among certain of *our* sons."[16] Moreover, the Holy Father's chagrin that the time-honored philosophy of the Church ". . . is scorned by some who shamelessly call it outmoded in form, and rationalistic . . . in its method of thought" is hardly an observation confined to those non-Scholastic circles which have considered Thomism outmoded for centuries.[17]

There is a fairly obvious liaison here to the sentiments expressed by the Holy Father in 1946 in the course of Allocutions to the General Chapters of Friars Preachers and to the Jesuits, in which he claimed that a "new theology" was disparaging the value of the perennial philosophy.[18] The Holy Father was con-

[15] M. Labourdette, O.P., "Les enseignements de l'encyclique 'Humani generis,'" *Revue thomiste*, 58, 1 (1950), 32; Garrigou-Lagrange, *Angelicum* article, 3; Hayen, 137.

[16] *Humani generis*, 28.

[17] *Ibid.*, 32.

[18] *AAS*, 38, (1946), 384-88. For brief studies of the "new theology" consult David Greenstock's "Thomism and the New Theology" in *The Thomist*, October, 1950; Gustave Weigel's "The Historical Background of the Encyclical Humani Generis" in *Theological Studies*, 12 (June, 1951); and John J. Galvin's "A Critical Survey of Modern Conceptions of Doctrinal Development" in *Proceedings of the Fifth Annual Meeting*, The Catholic Theological Society of America, 1950. Fr. Galvin and Dr. Greenstock both wrote their articles shortly before the publication of *Humani generis*.

cerned by the "new theology" group's apparent disdain for a permanent metaphysics which would not be altered by the particular exigencies of any age. The philosophical implications of the "new theology" are unavoidable, as the mentality described by the Holy Father would relegate Thomistic philosophy and its method to honored but ineffectual places in the museum of Christian thought, as relics too cherished to be discarded hastily, but too outmoded to be used profitably. Dr. David Greenstock of the Colegio de Ingleses in Valladolid tells of an interesting incident that occurred in November, 1949, when Spain's most famous philosopher, José Ortega y Gasset announced rather grandiloquently that ". . . the Roman Catholic, Apostolic Church is about to relinquish both Aristotelianism and Thomism; and that a new theology is being forged which is in close relationship with that of the Greek Fathers." This comment is all the more striking when one considers that Spanish Thomists in general have been almost universally critical of the philosophical relativism that is to be discerned in the "new theology."

As has been generally observed, the Holy Father mentions no names and condemns no works specifically. Moreover, the tone, though unmistakably firm, is moderate. Even Fr. Labourdette, who, previous to the appearance of the encyclical, did not hesitate to catalogue some of the errors he perceived in the writings of the new school, refused to identify the personalities to whom the encyclical made reference, but preferred to leave such a delicate task to future historians of theology.[19] It was inevitable, however, that certain figures were associated with the deviations mentioned in *Humani generis*, and for the most part, they were the same people who had been cited in the "new theology" controversy. Greenstock cites as a good source of the personalities involved Msgr. Bruno de Solages' "Pour l'honneur de la théologie" which appeared in the *Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique*, 48 (1947). Msgr. de Solages, rector of the Catholic

[19] Cf. *Dialogue théologique*, Pièces du débat entre *La Revue Thomiste* d'une part et les R.R. P.R. de Lubac, Daniélou, Bouillard, Fessard, von Balthasar, S.J., d'autre part. *Les Arcades*, Saint-Maximin, 1947; also Fr. Labourdette's article in *Revue thomiste*, 58 (1950), 32.

Institute of Toulouse, wrote not as a critic, but as one prominently associated with the new movement.[20]

No article or catalogue seems to capture the essence of the movement, however, for the simple reason that it has been more of a mood than a program, an attitude of mind rather than an expressed credo. It has been a mood, but it has been an anti-metaphysical mood; it has been an attitude of mind, but it can be a dangerous attitude of mind. And the fact that the encyclical has checked this approach is something for which the metaphysician as well as the theologian can be grateful.

One of the obvious philosophical aberrations mentioned in the encyclical is that of dialectical materialism, which is mentioned twice.[21] Ordinarily references to such a blatant philosophical monstrosity would be overlooked, but this philosophy too has infiltrated into Catholic circles. Recently, members of the French hierarchy felt it necessary to reaffirm the precautions and condemnations of the *Humani generis*. *Le Monde* on Feb. 3, 1952, reported that the bishops of Marseilles, Strasbourg, and Paris specifically warned their flocks of Communist infiltration into Catholic thought. Specific examples of communistic inroads are to be found in the recalcitrance of Fr. Alighiero Tondi and Abbé Jean Massin and his adherents, the periodic effervescences of Abbé Boulier, and the recent writing of Père Montlucard of Lyons. The last named in an article "Les événements et la foi," written in the review *Jeunesse de l'église*, espouses a faith that is not to intrude into civil and social activity. Dialectical materialism is apparently a purifying fire destined to cauterize the social wounds in the body politic. The adoption of dialectical materialism as the philosophical vehicle for the expression of Catholic truth proceeds from the conviction that any philosophical system can be tailored to Catholic dogma. This theory is rendered completely untenable by the encyclical.[22] In philosophy as in other fields, the exotic has a peculiar fascination for the faddist. It is interesting to note, however, that the first

[20] Msgr. de Solages denounced Garrigou-Lagrange's interpretation of texts of the exponents of the "new theology" and what he called an arbitrary linking into one school: Bouillard, Blondel, de Lubac, Fessard,and Theilhard de Chardin.

[21] *Humani generis*, 5, and 32.

[22] *Ibid.*, 32.

reference to dialectical materialism in the encyclical refers exclusively to those outside the Church.[23]

On the controversial question of existentialism, the encyclical's three references cannot provide a complete answer.[24] The question has been somewhat confused by the tendency of Thomists to use the word existential to signify a fundamental approach to being and truth in opposition to what is called the essentialist approach of the Platonists.[25] Obviously, the encyclical is not referring to this Thomistic existentialism. Nor does it concern itself specifically with a formally atheistic existentialism, although this type would be included in the relativist group adverted to in paragraph 6. The Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office on Oct. 27, 1948, condemned and ordered put on the *Index* all of the works of Jean Paul Sartre.[26] On the following day this action was approved, confirmed, and ordered published by the Holy Father. Although consecrated to the individual existent self-enclosed absurdity called man, Sartre constantly talks of essences in the course of uttering his murky generalities.

Juan Alfaro considers the encyclical a blanket condemnation of all forms of existentialism, which seems to be a rather gratuitous interpretation. *Humani generis* assumes rather than affirms the condemnation of atheistic existentialism such as that of Sartre; it doubtless condemns the anti-metaphysical so-called Christian existentialism of Kierkegaard and Jaspers, and the more neutral existentialism of Heidegger, as that philosopher now conceives of it.[27] But it is by no means clear that the encyclical condemns the so-called Catholic existentialism of Gabriel Marcel. It is only if

[23] *Ibid.*, 33.

[24] *Ibid.*, 6, 15, and 32.

[25] The contrast here is between the Thomistic and Platonist approaches, not the Aristotelian and the Platonist. Aristotle, as Renard points out, never completely developed existential causality; it is quite probable that he is fundamentally an essentialist. Cf. *The Philosophy of God* by Henri Renard, S.J. (Milwaukee: Bruce, 1951), p. 19.

[26] *AAS*, 40 (1948), 511.

[27] Heidegger's approach to the problem of God and ontology has been frequently misunderstood. It is certainly an oversimplification to identify him as anti-metaphysical and erroneous to identify him as atheistic. He shares the opinion of the crisis theologians that philosophical reason is limited to the finite order. Cf. James Collins' superb critical study: *The Existentialists* (Chicago: Regnery, 1952), p. 186.

one considers the fundamental existential experience ". . . an encounter with utter nothingness . . ." that all forms will be considered condemned *in toto*. It is possible that even the existential approach to reality that is not fundamentally atheistic and anti-metaphysical may show at a later stage of its development a variance with the philosophico-theological synthesis which is not now apparent. The general reluctance of the existentialists to accommodate reality to any system may make the preference for Thomism in the Catholic synthesis difficult to accept.

The fact remains, however, that concern for individual existence, and emphasis on contemporary struggle are in themselves neither atheistic nor anti-metaphysical. There are many profoundly religious personalities in Catholic circles who have tried —sometimes injudiciously—to explore the existentialist approach to our times. The Holy Father has not made a wholesale condemnation of existentialism in this encyclical, although one can infer quite legitimately that the existentialist approach is generally at variance with the *philosophia perennis* if not with the spirit of inquiry which inspires it.

A cognate method which the Holy Father condemns, and to which reference has already been made is that of historicism, which interprets truth and objectivity in a context of Heraclitean change.[28] Historicism seems to be little more than historical appraisal of philosophical and theological questions in terms of what might be called an evolving axiology. Again we hear the theme: there are no absolutes or immutable truths.

The encyclical contains too a number of incidental references which are not treated in detail. These are: the ethical implications of the new relativism, evolutionary pantheism, pragmatism, idealism, and immanentism.[29] They are to be found in those portions of the encyclical which discuss the main philosophical interests, and are introduced for purposes of contrast.

Were one to summarize briefly the chief philosophical impli-

[28] *Humani generis*, 7. Fr. Weigel cites as an authority on historicism Francesco Olgiatti, a contributor to the "Humani Generis edition" of the *Revista di filosofia neo-scolastica*, 43 (Jan.–Feb., 1951).

[29] The "ethics" reference, 34; evolutionary pantheism, 5; idealism, 6, 15; pragmatism, 6; immanentism, 6, 15, 32.

cations of the encyclical, he might choose propositions that would read something like this:

(1) *Humani generis* is an explicit condemnation of the philosophical relativism which denies any permanent and objective value to metaphysical truths.

(2) Human reason by its unaided efforts can arrive at a true and certain knowledge of the existence of God and the natural law. To this extent, the encyclical is one of optimism, confidence in truth and in man's power to attain it.

(3) Philosophical and theological relativism are inevitable consequences of the rejection of metaphysics.

(4) The encyclical clearly establishes the fact that complete philosophical liberty is not the prerogative of the professor actually teaching in the Catholic educational institution. St. Thomas' is officially the philosophy of the Catholic school.

(5) *Humani generis* is by no means a pronouncement of Integralist severity, but an invitation to constructive applications of Thomistic thought to the problems of our day, divested, if necessary, of those scholastic aids found less useful in the twentieth century world. The Christian philosopher is not asked to be an archaeologist, destined to spend his time rummaging about the embalmed wisdom of the past, but a thinker who continues the quest for truth within a specific tradition which he may ". . . prudently enrich . . . with the fruits of the progress of the human mind."[30] It is our duty, as Fernand Van Steenberghen of Louvain expresses it "to free the Master's doctrine from its medieval bark and to transpose it into the language and mentality of our own time."[31] The philosopher in the service of the Church is a man with a mission. *Humani generis* is indisputably a condemnation and a warning, but it is also a summons to work that remains to be done.

ROBERT PAUL MOHAN, S.S.

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

[30] *Humani generis*, 30. St. Thomas himself says in *De caelo*: "Philosophical study is not for the purpose of knowing what men have taught, but for the purpose of knowing the truth of things." I, 22.

[31] Fernand Van Steenberghen. "Thomism in a Changing World," *The New Scholasticism*, 26 (Jan., 1951), 46.

Answers to Questions

PATRONAL FEAST OF PARISH

Question: My parish is dedicated to Our Lady, Queen of Peace. I am at a loss to know when to celebrate the patronal feast of the parish.

Answer: The Congregation of Sacred Rites in a decision (No. 2529) states that the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary is to be celebrated as the Titular Feast of those churches which are dedicated to the Blessed Virgin Mary without any specification as to which of her mysteries is to be celebrated.

BENEDICTION RUBRICS

Question: Is it correct for the congregation to stand before the celebrant comes down to the floor from the altar platform after he has given Benediction of the Most Blessed Sacrament? I always thought the congregation should wait for the celebrant to rise before they do. Then, too, what hymns require kneeling after Benediction? Are there any others besides the *Miserere* and *Rorate coeli desuper*?

Answer: The authors instruct us to stand after the Blessed Sacrament has been reposed and the tabernacle has been closed. It is not necessary to wait until the celebrant of benediction descends to the sanctuary floor.

We are not aware of any regulation requiring the congregation to kneel for the hymns mentioned by our inquirer. They kneel for the verse "Te ergo quaesumus" of the *Te Deum* but immediately after it they arise.

MARIAN DEVOTION

Question: Is there an approved devotion in honor of the Blessed Virgin Mary in the practice of reversing deliberately the devotion of the Way of the Cross in starting with the 14th station and

continuing to the first? This practice is called "The Return of Mary from Calvary." It seems to be a private devotion of some over-zealous persons.

Answer: We have made numerous inquiries about the devotion just described above and met no one who had ever heard of such a practice. To say the least, it is not an approved devotion.

HOLY WEEK FUNERAL

Question: One of my very good parishioners died on Monday night of Holy Week. Since Wednesday seemed too early for the burial what was the proper arrangement to be made for Holy Thursday services?

Answer: The funeral Mass is forbidden on the last three days of Holy Week. If the funeral took place on Holy Thursday, prayers could have been recited at the home and at the grave, the absolution and burial services as contained in the Ritual. The body is not to be brought to the church. The Mass offered on Holy Thursday could have been for the repose of the person being buried, or a Solemn Funeral Mass could have been sung on the first convenient day after Easter.

The Congregation of Sacred Rites has decreed that on the more solemn feasts, if the obsequies are to be held, they should take place in the afternoon after the Vespers of the feast and at an hour free from any sacred function.

TRANSFERRING THE BLESSED SACRAMENT

Question: What is the proper dress for a priest or a deacon when he transfers the Blessed Sacrament from a school auditorium to the church? Such a situation arises every Sunday in our parish when due to the large crowds the school hall is used as an auxiliary oratory.

Answer: The priest wears cassock, surplice, stole and humeral veil. He is preceded in the procession to the church by an altar boy carrying a lighted candle and ringing a bell which serves as a warning to the laity that the priest is approaching with the Blessed Sacrament.

PRIEST'S WAKE

Question: While a priest's body is lying in state in church must the Masses offered during that time be requiem Masses? Do you leave the six lighted candles around the casket while Mass is being celebrated?

Answer: If the priests offering Mass have already said the Mass *in die obitus* and the Ordo does not call for a votive or requiem Mass, the Mass of the day must be offered. The presence of the corpse does not permit changing the requirements of the Ordo. The candles surrounding the casket remain lighted while Mass is being offered.

CANDLE DIFFICULTY

Question: When we have Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament we are not able with convenience to place candelabra or branched candlesticks on the altar and thus fulfill the law of the required number of candles. However, we place the branched candlesticks on pedestals as close to the altar as possible. How literal must we interpret the regulation of the authors that the candles must be placed on the altar?

Answer: The ideal situation is to place all the candles on the altar. However, we are of the opinion that this need not be interpreted too literally. With flowers on the altar for Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament it is not always possible to place the required candles on the altar and do so gracefully. We must keep in mind that the so-called "high candles" can be counted in on the required number.

At this time we might recall what Dr. Edwin Ryan (*Candles in the Roman Rite*) says: "The custom of placing candles *on* the Altar is recent. It has not been traced back further than the sixteenth century. Before that the candles were placed *near* the Altar but not *on* it, but to revive that custom now for candles required in a given service would not be permitted."

SIDE ALTAR TABERNACLE

Question: In our church we have daily exposition of the Most Blessed Sacrament. A ciborium is reserved at the side altar

where a noon-day Mass is celebrated and Holy Communion is distributed. Resting on the tabernacle of this side altar are (1) a statue of the Blessed Mother; (2) flowers in front of the statue; (3) a small crucifix. Are these permissible over a tabernacle when a ciborium is reserved? After Benediction in the evening the ciborium is returned from the side altar to the main altar immediately after the Divine Praises. Does the altar boy ring a bell as the ciborium is being transferred?

Answer: The Congregation of Sacred Rites has very specifically stated that the top of the tabernacle should not serve as a stand for relics, flowers or statues. Again the same Congregation states that the top of the tabernacle is not to serve as a support for the altar crucifix and if so that custom or practice is only tolerated.

An altar boy should accompany the priest transferring the ciborium to the main altar and while so doing he rings the altar bell. However, transferring the ciborium back to the main altar should be done not after the recitation of the Divine Praises but after the entire Benediction ceremony has been completed.

GOOD FRIDAY PERMISSION

Question: Is it permitted to begin the Mass of the Pre-Sanctified on Good Friday at noon? Is a special permission of the Bishop necessary when the statutes of the diocese permit the beginning of Mass as late as an hour after midday?

Answer: There is no general legislation forbidding the Mass of the Pre-Sanctified at noon of Good Friday. Only specific diocesan legislation would forbid it. No special permission is required of the Ordinary or the chancery office.

ANOTHER HOLY WEEK PROBLEM

Question: When Deacons chant the Passion on Palm Sunday or one of the other three days, do they face the altar?

Answer: Fortescue directs the Passion singers to proceed, after they have made their proper entrance and bows, to the place

where the gospel is usually sung during a solemn High Mass. They certainly would not face the altar in this position.

WALTER J. SCHMITZ, S.S.

SUNDAY OBSERVANCE

Question: If the members of a Catholic family living far away from the church are unable on this account to attend Mass on Sunday, are they bound by the divine law, promulgated in the third commandment, to devote some portion of the Sunday to private worship?

Answer: The solution of this question goes back to the problem of the basis of the law prescribing the sanctification of Sunday. Under the Old Dispensation the divine law, contained in the third commandment, imposed on the chosen people the obligation to observe the Sabbath, the seventh day of the week, as the Lord's Day. However, this precept, like the other ceremonial prescriptions of the Old Law, ceased with the promulgation of the New Law (Cf. St. Thomas, *Sum. theol.*, I-II, q. 103, a. 3). In the Christian Dispensation the Lord's Day has become the first day of the week. Some theologians have held that the sanctification of Sunday is commanded by divine-positive law, but it is the more common opinion that this duty arises from ecclesiastical legislation (Cf. Damen, *Theologia moralis* [Turin, 1947], I, n. 593).

For the due observance of Sunday the Church has commanded that Christians attend Mass and abstain from servile work as well as certain other types of activity, such as holding court. The people described by the questioner must abstain from forbidden work, as far as they are able; but, in the presumption that they are excused from hearing Mass by reason of distance from the church, they are not bound to perform any special acts of worship on Sunday—though they must pray, make acts of the theological virtues, etc., with sufficient frequency and regularity throughout the year. Needless to say, however, such persons should be strongly urged to set aside a period of time on Sunday for devotional acts, such as reading the Mass of the day in the vernacular and reciting the rosary. It should be noted also that

according to some theologians there is a divine-positive precept of hearing Mass several times in the year (Cf. Damen, *op. cit.*, I, n. 529), though others deny that such a precept exists (Cf. Guiniven, *The Precept of Hearing Mass* [Washington, D. C.: C.U.A. Press, 1942], 56).

RESULTS OF AN INVALID SACRAMENT

Question: If, through some mistake, a male child was invalidly baptized, and later entered the priesthood, his priestly ordination would necessarily be invalid. Now, if a dying person, seeking the ministrations of this invalidly ordained priest, had only attrition when he confessed his sins, the absolution would not confer the state of grace, as it would in the case of a validly ordained priest. How can this case be reconciled with the axiom: "Facienti quod in se est Deus non denegat gratiam"?

Answer: Cases such as the questioner presents can easily be imagined, but in passing judgment on them we must not forget the doctrine of Divine Providence. Our Lord is watching over His Church, and certainly His special care is extended over those who will enter the ministry. It is difficult to believe that He would permit a substantial defect in the baptism of a child who will one day be enrolled in the ranks of His priests. And even if this were possible, and the circumstances pictured by the questioner were realized, we can be certain that a person who would seek absolution from the supposed priest, disposed only by attrition, would receive sufficient grace to make an act of perfect contrition and thus obtain justification, which he believed he was attaining from the valid and fruitful reception of the Sacrament of Penance.

ATTENDANCE AT "B" MOVIES

Question: When a lay person asks a priest whether or not he may see a "B" movie, what answer should the priest give?

Answer: The so-called "B" movies are those that are recorded in the listing of the Legion of Decency as "objectionable in part." Sometimes the objectionable feature is the fact that such sins as divorce and suicide are presented as commendable, sometimes it

is obscenity. The theological solution of the problem of attendance at such films is that those to whom the picture offers a proximate occasion of sin may not see it, those to whom it offers no such danger may *per se* attend without committing sin. In other words, it is a problem of a relative occasion of sin, the solution of which depends on the moral strength and inclinations of the individual concerned; consequently, it is not easy to give an answer in particular cases. Moreover, we say that *per se* a person may attend a picture in this category if it presents no proximate occasion of sin to him; but it should be remembered that *per accidens* it might be a grave sin for him to go to a theatre where this picture is being shown, because of the scandal he will thereby give. The best advice a priest can give to those who question him on this matter is to avoid all "B" movies, in the hope that such a course may eventually induce producers to present to the public only those pictures that are entirely unobjectionable. It is a deplorable fact that there are not a few Catholics who have not the slightest objection to attending movies that are "objectionable in part."

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

CHRIST IN THE STREETS

Yet God has only one intention. He desires the eternal salvation of all men. Beginning with creation, everything which He has done has been a move to bring all the children of His omnipotence into the everlasting arms of His love. He came to Magdala and to the home of Simon, and He came to the foot of the Cross, for the one reason. Through knowing Christ, men would get to know and love the Father. But how can the sinners of the world be turned towards good and away from evils which masquerade as good if Goodness, as Magdalen saw it, is gone? The modern world has bitter need for a Christ they can see in the streets.

—Fr. Thomas H. Moore, S.J., in *The Morning Offering* (New York: Apostleship of Prayer, 1952), p. 3.

Book Reviews

YANKEE PRIEST. By Edward F. Murphy, S.S.J. New York: Doubleday and Co., 1952. Pp. 316. $3.50.

Although in their beginnings, *Yankee Priest* and *The Cardinal* have much in common, describing the home life of two poverty stricken Massachusetts families of Irish descent, one who reads the first sixty pages of Fr. Murphy's autobiography detects a great difference. *Yankee Priest* is, like its author, authentic. The harshest criticism which may be offered of the Josephite Father's latest literary work is that the title is inept. As Bishop Sheen wrote in the February *American Ecclesiastical Review,* "When most people use the word 'priest,' they preface it by the glorious title of 'Catholic.'" It is quite apparent that Fr. Murphy is a Catholic priest in the fullest sense of the word. For that reason, at the age of fifteen he left his home in Salem, Mass., to follow an older brother in the poorest section of the Lord's vineyard, consecrating his life to spreading the faith among the colored.

Fr. Murphy's pen is feathered with charity. His Catholicity stems from a home in which faith was the dominant theme. With a subtle charm he invites his readers into the privacy of a typical Irish Catholic family. There is a deal of pathos in the early days of Fr. Ed Murphy. He kept his sense of humor and was ordained in 1918. Even the impact of the School of Philosophy of The Catholic University of America, where, under the tutelage of Dr. Ignatius Smith he wrote *St. Thomas' Political Theories and Democracy,* did not destroy his sense of humor. Although former Vice President Henry Wallace read this dissertation with much interest, it did not set the world on fire, even though two hundred copies, ignited by spontaneous combustion, nearly burned down Epiphany College.

While still a seminarian, Ed Murphy began to write, first to buy a wedding gift for his sister, and then to extend the scope of his benefactions. One of his boyhood chums, destined to play an important role in Fr. Murphy's later life, was John Nelson Goucher, more popularly known as Eddie Dowling. The two great characters in this autobiography are Mrs. Murphy and Mrs. Goucher. Through assisting at St. Malachy's Church, young Fr. Murphy became the confidant of other celebrities of the theatrical world. Eddie Dowling was both the benefactor and the beneficiary of the Murphy genius.

Young Fr. Murphy had faults and the writer portrays his trials and disappointments fearlessly. Xavier University, the dream of Mother Drexel, was to him both a challenge and a realization. To it he has devoted most of his priestly energies, while also serving as a pastor of souls in New Orelans.

It was the alert editorial staff of *Extension* which projected Fr. Murphy into fame as an author, discovering in *The Scarlet Lily* a real literary triumph which incidentally sold 150,000 copies and was used as the basis of a movie scenario. Fortunately neither fame nor Hollywood won Fr. Murphy away from his primary interest, work among the colored.

Most authors at one time or other divest themselves of autobiographical material, as necessary a process as clearing debris off a battleship for action. *Yankee Priest* is a suitable requiem for Ed Murphy, a good and great priest. In it he also reveals a knowledge of the colored who are seeking faith, particularly the young Negroes who came to him for guidance. The Church needs a Catholic Roark Bradford who can describe with sympathy the struggles of a handicapped segment of our country for truth and a place in the sun. It has been said that the Negro is naturally a Catholic. Who better than Fr. Murphy among contemporary Catholic writers can describe the brave and cheerful humanity of our colored brethren? His next ten books should deal *exclusively* with this field.

Although *Yankee Priest* is far superior in style and revelation of the priesthood to *The Cardinal,* it will not have such a popular sale because Fr. Murphy sticks the priesthood in your eye on every page—and even some Catholics are afraid to become better acquainted with the dreams of a priest. To his brother priests Fr. Murphy has in this work given new hope and inspiration.

MAURICE S. SHEEHY

THE WISDOM OF THE TALMUD. By Rabbi Ben Zion Bokser. New York: Philosophical Library, 1951. Pp. xx+180. $3.75.

Rabbi Ben Zion Bokser has given us in this little volume a very readable and pleasant introduction to the Talmud. The style is popular, and interesting excerpts, generously offered, help to clarify the author's analysis and enliven his presentation. The book is divided into two parts of almost equal length, the first dealing with the historical and literary development of the Talmud and the latter synthesizing its teaching under various heads.

The Talmud was born of the realization that the Bible needs supplementation, that biblical legislation, especially in the realm of cult and ethics, needs to be adapted to changing circumstances of life. Hence the author defines it as "an encyclopedia of Jewish culture; in form, a supplement to the Bible, and in its contents, a summation of a thousand years of intellectual, religious and social achievements of the Jewish people." Rabbi Bokser's book comes to us under the auspices of the Philosophical Library; this fact and the title of the work combine to assure us that the author's intention is to outline Judaism's contribution to human wisdom. It is from that point of view we should criticise it.

To begin with, rabbinic ratiocination can be rather bewildering to minds accustomed to following arguments circumscribed by the strict rules of Western logic. To such minds the reasoning processes of Talmudic scholars give the overall impression of a strained and often desperate casuistry, in which premises are simply invented and given divine sanction by being attributed to God—by what right one is at a loss to discern. For instance, to establish the authority of rabbinic interpretation as against the fixed authority of the sacred text, the famous Talmudist Rabbi Jannai argued thus:

> If the Torah had been given in fixed and immutable formulations, it could not have endured. Thus, Moses pleaded with the Lord, "Master of the Universe, reveal unto me the final truth in each problem of doctrine and law." To which the Lord replied, "There are no pre-existent final truths in doctrine or law; the truth is the considered judgment of the majority of authoritative interpreters in every generation" . . . (p. 7).

In connection with the principle stated in this excerpt, one wonders what sort of philosophy—in whatever way you choose to define it—could be built on such a nonchalant attitude towards truth. Consider also the following:

> But how was the Torah to guide life if its official interpreters could not agree?
>
> The Pharisees had solved this problem by developing a fine tolerance. All views that developed in the course of their deliberations were regarded as equally sincere attempts to understand and apply the ideals of the Torah to the necessities of life. Men were therefore advised to exercise their own discretion and follow the particular school of thought that best expressed their own conception of right and wrong. . . . On questions of theology and ethics, individuals remained essentially free to formulate their own doctrines in accordance with the dictates of their own conscience (pp. 57-58).
>
> Indeed, there has never been formulated an official creed in Israel as a criterion of loyalty to the mandates of Jewish life (p. 109).

> Talmudic law concerns itself with doctrine, but it does not establish dogmas that must be believed in as true. On the level of opinion great freedom existed in the Jewish community and individuals were allowed to follow their own inclination of heart and mind. . . . Truth cannot be contained in one easy formula (p. 135).

To judge from Rabbi Bokser's analysis, the wisdom of the Talmud is a system which, while recognizing God and His place in the universe, concentrates its attention on the perfection of mankind as such, apparently as a *finis ultimus*. This mankind is on a steady march towards ultimate self-realization, self-perfection. Nowhere is there a discussion of the immortality of the soul or of the individual's eternal destiny. This note of self-sufficient humanitarianism is struck early in the book, when on p. 8 is stated the principle of "man's complete sovereignty in the development of what we may call the supplementary Torah." And again we read, in the same strain, that "the Talmud even traced the authority of the Bible itself not so much to its divine source as to the consent of the people who fully agreed to live by it" (p. 108).

This impression of humanitarianism is created not so much by the exclusion of God from the system—for he is by no means excluded—as by a disproportionate emphasis on man himself as the end of man's striving. It is admitted that man's ultimate purpose is to "glorify his Maker through the cultivation of virtue and the continued perfection of his life," but the principal demand in achieving this perfection is "ethical—to act with compassion and loving-kindness towards God's creatures" (p. 90). In the words of Rabbi Akiba: "This is the most fundamental principle enunciated in the Torah: 'Love thy neighbor as thyself'" *(ibid.)*. Or, as another Talmudist expounded, "it is greater to serve one's fellowman than to preoccupy oneself with divine communion" (p. 105). It is certainly true that "the anchor on which all the elements of the good life rest is the recognition of God's sovereignty," but God is the port as well as the anchor of the good life.

The wisdom of the Talmud recognizes a dualism in man's nature, but views it in rather unrealistic fashion. "In present circumstances the so-called evil impulse dominates life, but as men mature in their development the good impulse gains ascendancy and the proper balance is achieved between these two basic drives of our natures" (p. 93). But this evil impulse is not really evil, for it was created by the all-good God. And, say the rabbis, "were it not for that impulse, a man would not build a house, marry a wife, beget children or conduct business affairs" (p. 93). The good impulse drives man on to fulfill his special function in the fulfillment of the cosmic purpose. Israel, as the guardian of the Torah, has a unique role to play in bringing mankind to the achievement of this purpose, which we find explained thus:

In their trials no less than in their triumphs, therefore, God is guiding mankind toward their destiny. But its fulfillment is a long process toward which men climb slowly in their varied vicissitudes of history. When the theme of history reaches its climax, the Talmudists were confident there would be ushered in a state of unusual human perfection. Then men will become completely reconciled with God and surrender unreservedly in loving obedience to His will. Oppression and hatred will then disappear and a new order of righteousness and love will be established in the world. It will involve the full realization of the hopes of the prophets and the fulfillment of Israel's mission in history. And it is to be brought about through a human instrument, the Messianic deliverer (p. 100).

The author does not tell us the exact nature of the Messiah's work, and the time of his coming is unkown. The latter "was generally held to depend on the degree of progress men will have achieved in their development" (p. 101). We find ourselves again face to face with that maddening blank wall on pp. 148-149:

The rabbis envisioned an even wider scope for religious and moral inwardness to be attained as history reaches its final unfolding. They anticipated that inwardness would eventually vanquish law altogether. . . . In the present state of human immaturity, however, the law is an indispensable guide to action. It is, moreover, a preparation for the next stage of civilization, when the law which has come "to ennoble the lives of men" will have done its work. A new human race will then arise to live on the level of true inwardness, in free gestures of adoration of God and in an all-embracing love for their fellow-men. The rabbis expressed this vision in their conception of the three stages of human history. The first is the stage of "chaos," before the leaven of a divine law has begun to work in the world; the second is the sage of "Torah"; and the last is the stage of Messianic liberation and enlightenment which will finally bring man to his preordained destiny.

But what precisely is this preordained destiny? Is it the glory of the last stage of human history? Then what of the millions of just men who will have lived out their life-span in the preceding stages?

The Talmudists recognized the facts of man's freedom of will and of sin. But do they not bury their heads in the sand when they announce (p. 99) that "whenever men defy the truths of the Torah . . . God passes judgment upon them; and the discipline of suffering reinforces the native appeal of truth itself in leading men to repentance"? This unrealisitc generalization dodges the problem of evil, a problem which any system of "Wisdom" should at least face squarely.

In the field of morals we find high ideals proposed. That is why it is so disturbing to see divorce and contraception countenanced—with restrictions, it is true—but countenanced nonetheless (p. 112). And a Christian winces when he reads statements like the following:

"Man will be held to account for having deprived himself of good things which the world has offered him" (p. 79). "The Talmud denounced asceticism, even when religiously motivated, as sinful, for it withdrew esesntial creative energies from the tasks of civilizations" (p. 118)—again that distortion of the proper sense of values. "The *nazirite* whose vow to reject wine is recognized as binding in the Bible (Nu. 6:1-4), the rabbis held to be a sinner, and they added: 'If a person who withholds himself from wine is called a sinner, how much more so is one a sinner who withdraws from all of life's enjoyments?'" (p. 131).

This is admittedly a one-sided critique. There is much, very much, in the Talmud that is beautiful and good and true, and Rabbi Bokser has presented it in a very attractive fashion. But any system which lays claim to the exalted title of Wisdom and thus sets itself up as a normative guide for human life, suffers from a serious basic defect in leaving the end of human life ill-defined and vague. For all human action is determined by the ultimate end of human life. And an end which consists in some obscure, gradually evolving perfection of mankind as such falls short of the mark. Can it be that the author, in an effort at conciseness, has not given us a full—and hence true—picture of the Wisdom of the Talmud?

JOHN CASTELOT

THE GATES OF DANNEMORA. By John Bonn. New York: Doubleday, 1951. Pp. 276. $3.00.

This dramatic and sentimental presentation of the work of a well-known prison chaplain should provide a fascinating story for the average reader. Though Hollywood may not have accepted Fr. Hyland's conditions for movie production in the past, the author of *The Gates of Dannemora* has provided the basis for a script that should prove attractive to those who have an eye on the box office.

The prison chapel of St. Dismas will stand as a memorial to the courage and persistence of a great chaplain. ("Father, you never give up.") However, the public may overlook the fact that, woven into the beautiful gothic structure, is a design of a new way of life for the men of Dannemora. Apart from the therapeutic value of the actual construction work, the building proclaims the importance of the spiritual in a materialistic atmosphere.

The opposition of certain elements, the indifference of others, and the initial scepticism of his flock are merely indications of an attitude